UM-TH-99-07
hep-th/9912164

TASI LECTURES ON BRANES, BLACK HOLES AND ANTI-DE SITTER SPACE[1].

M. J. Duff[2]

Randall Laboratory, Department of Physics, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1120

arXiv:hep-th/9912164v2 20 Jan 2000

ABSTRACT

In the light of the duality between physics in the bulk of anti-de Sitter space and a conformal field theory on the boundary, we review the $M2$, $D3$ and $M5$ branes and how their near-horizon geometry yields the compactification of $D = 11$ supergravity on S^7, Type IIB supergravity on S^5 and $D = 11$ supergravity on S^4, respectively. We discuss the "Membrane at the End of the Universe" idea and its relation to the corresponding superconformal singleton theories that live on the boundary of the AdS_4, AdS_5 and AdS_7 vacua. The massless sectors of these compactifications are described by the maximally supersymmetric $D = 4$, $D = 5$ and $D = 7$ gauged supergravities. We construct the non-linear Kaluza-Klein ansätze describing the embeddings of the $U(1)^4$, $U(1)^3$ and $U(1)^2$ truncations of these supergravities, which admit 4-charge AdS_4, 3-charge AdS_5 and 2-charge AdS_7 black hole solutions. These enable us to embed the black hole solutions back in ten and eleven dimensions and reinterpret them as $M2$, $D3$ and $M5$ branes spinning in the transverse dimensions with the black hole charges given by the angular momenta of the branes. A comprehensive Appendix lists the field equations, symmetries and transformation rules of $D = 11$ supergravity, Type IIB supergravity, and the $M2$, $D3$ and $M5$ branes.

[1]Based on talks delivered at the Theoretical Advanced Study Institute, Boulder, Colorado, June 1999 and the Banff Summer School, Alberta, Canada, June-July 1999. Research supported in part by NSF Grant PHY-9722090.

[2]mduff@umich.edu

Contents

1 INTRODUCTION **4**

1.1 Supergravity, supermembranes and M-theory 4

1.2 The Kaluza-Klein idea 5

1.3 The field content 10

1.4 The AdS/CFT correspondence 14

1.5 Plan of the lectures 15

1.6 Problems 1 17

2 ELEVEN DIMENSIONAL SUPERGRAVITY **17**

2.1 Bosonic field equations 17

2.2 $AdS_4 \times S^7$ 18

2.3 Consistent truncation to the massless modes 21

2.4 The supermembrane solution 23

2.5 $AdS_7 \times S^4$ 26

2.6 The superfivebrane solution 27

2.7 Problems 2 29

3 TYPE IIB SUPERGRAVITY **29**

3.1 Bosonic field equations 29

3.2 $AdS_5 \times S^5$ 30

3.3 The self-dual superthreebrane solution 31

3.4 Problems 3 33

4 THE M2-BRANE, D3-BRANE AND M5-BRANE **33**

4.1 The M2-brane 33

4.2 The M5-brane 34

4.3 The D3-brane 37

4.4 Problems 4 37

5 ADS/CFT : THE MEMBRANE AT THE END OF THE UNIVERSE **37**

5.1 Singletons live on the boundary 37

5.2 The membrane as a singleton: the membrane/supergravity bootstrap 39

5.3 Doubletons and tripletons revisited 42

5.4 The membrane at the end of the universe 44

5.5 Near horizon geometry and p-brane aristocracy 47
5.6 Supermembranes with fewer supersymmetries. Skew-whiffing. 49
5.7 The Maldacena conjecture 51
5.8 Problems 5 52

6 ANTI-DE SITTER BLACK HOLES 53
6.1 Introduction 53
6.2 S^5 reduction of Type IIB supergravity 56
6.3 D=5 AdS black holes 58
6.4 Rotating D3-brane 58
6.5 S^7 reduction of D=11 supergravity 61
6.6 D=4 AdS black holes 64
6.7 Rotating M2-brane 65
6.8 S^4 reduction of D=11 supergravity 66
6.9 D=7 AdS black holes 68
6.10 Rotating M5-brane 68
6.11 Charge as angular momentum 70
6.12 Magnetic black holes 70
6.13 Kaluza-Klein states as black holes 72
6.14 Recent Developments 73
6.15 Problems 6 74

7 SOLUTIONS TO PROBLEMS 74
7.1 Solutions 1 74
7.2 Solutions 2 76
7.3 Solutions 3 79
7.4 Solutions 4 82
7.5 Solutions 5 84
7.6 Solutions 6 85

8 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS 89

9 APPENDICES 90

A The Lagrangian, symmetries and transformation rules of D=11 supergravity 90

B The field equations, symmetries and transformation rules of Type IIB supergravity **92**

C The Lagrangian, symmetries and transformation rules of the M2-brane **94**

D The field equations, symmetries and transformation rules of the M5-brane **95**

E The Lagrangian, symmetries and transformation rules of the D3-brane **100**

F D=4, N=2 gauged supergravity **102**

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Supergravity, supermembranes and M-theory

A vital ingredient in the quest for a unified theory embracing all physical phenomena is *supersymmetry*, a symmetry which (a) unites bosons and fermions, (b) requires the existence of gravity and (c) places an upper limit of *eleven* on the dimension of spacetime. For these reasons, in the early 1980s many physicists looked to eleven-dimensional supergravity in the hope that it might provide that elusive superunified theory. Then in 1984 superunification underwent a major paradigm-shift: eleven-dimensional supergravity was knocked off its pedestal by ten-dimensional superstrings , one-dimensional objects whose vibrational modes represent the elementary particles. Unlike eleven-dimensional supergravity, superstrings provided a perturbatively finite theory of gravity which, after compactification to four spacetime dimensions, seemed in principle capable of explaining the Standard Model of the strong, weak and electromagnetic forces including the required *chiral* representations of quarks and leptons.

Despite these major successes, however, nagging doubts persisted about superstrings. First, many of the most important questions in string theory — How do strings break supersymmetry? How do they choose the right vacuum state? How do they explain the smallness of the cosmological constant? How do they resolve the apparent paradoxes of quantum black holes? — seemed incapable of being answered within the framework of a weak coupling perturbation expansion. They seemed to call for some new, *non-perturbative*, physics. Secondly, why did there appear to be *five* different mathematically consistent superstring theories: the $E_8 \times E_8$ heterotic string, the $SO(32)$ heterotic string, the $SO(32)$ Type I string, the Type IIA and Type IIB strings? If one is looking for a unique *Theory of Everything*, this seems like an embarrassment of riches! Thirdly, if supersymmetry permits eleven dimensions, why do superstrings stop at ten? This question became more acute with the discoveries of the elementary *supermembrane* in 1987 and its dual partner, the solitonic *superfivebrane*, in 1992. These are supersymmetric extended objects with respectively two and five dimensions moving in an eleven-dimensional spacetime. Finally, therefore, if we are going to generalize zero-dimensional point particles to one-dimensional strings, why stop there? Why not two-dimensional membranes or more generally p-dimensional objects (inevitably dubbed *p-branes*)? Although this latter possibility was pursued by a small but dedicated group of theorists, starting in about 1986, it was largely ignored by the mainstream physics community.

Well, the year 1995 witnessed a new paradigm-shift: perturbative ten-dimensional superstrings have in their turn been superseded by a new *non-perturbative* theory called *M-theory*, which describes, amongst other things, supermembranes and superfivebranes, which subsumes the above five consistent strings theories, and which has as its low-energy limit, eleven-dimensional supergravity! According to Fields Medalist Edward Witten "M stands for magical, mystery or membrane, according to taste". New evidence in favor of this theory is appearing daily on the internet and represents the most exciting development in the subject since 1984 when the superstring revolution first burst on the scene.

$$\left.\begin{array}{l} E_8 \times E_8 \ \ heterotic \ \ string \\ SO(32) \ \ heterotic \ \ string \\ SO(32) \ \ Type \ \ I \ \ string \\ Type \ \ IIA \ \ string \\ Type \ \ \text{IIB} \ \ string \end{array}\right\} M \ \ theory \tag{1.1}$$

Thus this new framework now provides the starting point for understanding a wealth of new non-perturbative phenomena, including string/string duality, Seiberg-Witten theory, quark confinement, QCD, particle physics phenomenology, quantum black holes, cosmology and, ultimately, their complete synthesis in a final theory of physics.

1.2 The Kaluza-Klein idea

Cast your minds back to 1919. Maxwell's theory of electromagnetism was well established and Einstein had recently formulated his General Theory of Relativity. By contrast, the strong and weak interactions were not well understood. In searching for a unified theory of the fundamental forces, therefore, it was natural to attempt to merge gravity with electromagnetism. This Kaluza was able to do through the remarkable device of postulating an extra fifth dimension for spacetime. Consider Einstein's theory of pure gravity in five spacetime dimensions with signature $(-,+,+,+,+)$. The line element is given by

$$ds_5{}^2 = g_{MN} dx^M dx^N \tag{1.2}$$

where $M = 0, 1, 2, 3, 4$. Kaluza then made the $4 + 1$ split

$$g_{MN} = e^{\phi/\sqrt{3}} \begin{pmatrix} g_{\mu\nu} + e^{-\sqrt{3}\phi} A_\mu A_\nu & e^{-\sqrt{3}\phi} A_\mu \\ e^{-\sqrt{3}\phi} A_\nu & e^{-\sqrt{3}\phi} \end{pmatrix} \tag{1.3}$$

where $x^M = (x^\mu, y)$, $\mu = 0, 1, 2, 3,$. Thus the fields $g_{\mu\nu}(x)$, $A_\mu(x)$ and $\phi(x)$ transform respectively as a tensor, a vector and a scalar under four-dimensional general coordinate

transformations. All this was at the classical level, of course, but in the modern parlance of quantum field theory, they would be described as the spin 2 graviton, the spin 1 photon and the spin 0 dilaton[3]. Of course it is not enough to call A_μ by the name photon, one must demonstrate that it satisfies Maxwell's equations and here we see the Kaluza miracle at work. After making the same $4+1$ split of the five-dimensional Einstein equations $R_{MN}=0$, we correctly recover not only the Einstein equations for $g_{\mu\nu}(x)$ but also the Maxwell equation for $A_\mu(x)$ and the massless Klein-Gordon equation for $\phi(x)$. Thus Maxwell's theory of electromagnetism is an inevitable consequence of Einstein's general theory of relativity, given that one is willing to buy the idea of a fifth dimension.

Attractive though Kaluza's idea was, it suffered from two obvious drawbacks. First, although the indices were allowed to range over $0,1,2,3,4$, for no very good reason the dependence on the extra coordinate y was suppressed. Secondly, if there is a fifth dimension why haven't we seen it? The resolution of both these problems was supplied by Oskar Klein in 1926. Klein insisted on treating the extra dimension seriously but assumed the fifth dimension to have circular topology so that the coordinate y is periodic, $0 \leq my \leq 2\pi$, where m has dimensions of mass. Thus the space has topology $R^4 \times S^1$. It is difficult to envisage a spacetime with this topology but a simpler analogy is provided by a garden hose: at large distances it looks like a line R^1 but closer inspection reveals that at every point on the line there is a little circle, and the topology is $R^1 \times S^1$. So it was that Klein suggested that there is a little circle at each point in four-dimensional spacetime.

Let us consider Klein's proposal from a modern perspective. We start with pure gravity in five dimensions described by the action

$$I_5 = \frac{1}{2{\kappa_5}^2}\int d^5x\sqrt{-g}R \tag{1.4}$$

I_5 is invariant under the five-dimensional general coordinate transformations

$$\delta g_{MN} = \partial_M \xi^P g_{PN} + \partial_N \xi^P g_{MP} + \xi^P \partial_P g_{MN} \tag{1.5}$$

The periodicity in y means that the fields $g_{MN}(x,y)$, $A_M(x,y)$ and $\phi(x,y)$ may be expanded in the form

$$g_{\mu\nu}(x,y) = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{n=\infty} g_{\mu\nu(n)}(x)e^{inmy},$$

$$A_\mu(x,y) = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{n=\infty} A_{\mu(n)}(x)e^{inmy},$$

[3]The dilaton was considered an embarrassment in 1919, and was (inconsistently) set equal to zero. However, it was later revived and subsequently stimulated Brans-Dicke theories of gravity. The dilaton also plays a crucial role in M-theory

$$\phi(x,y) = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{n=\infty} \phi_{(n)} e^{inmy} \tag{1.6}$$

with

$$g^*{}_{\mu\nu(n)}(x) = g_{\mu\nu(-n)}(x) \tag{1.7}$$

etc. So (as one now finds in all the textbooks) a Kaluza-Klein theory describes an infinite number of four-dimensional *fields*. However (as one finds in none of the textbooks) it also describes an infinite number of four-dimensional *symmetries* since we may also Fourier expand the general coordinate parameter $\xi^\mu(x,y)$ as follows

$$\xi^\mu(x,y) = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{n=\infty} \xi^\mu{}_{(n)}(x) e^{inmy}$$

$$\xi^4(x,y) = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{n=\infty} \xi^4{}_{(n)}(x) e^{inmy} \tag{1.8}$$

with $\xi^{*M}{}_{(n)} = \xi^M{}_{-(n)}$.

Let us first focus on the $n = 0$ modes in (1.6), which are just Kaluza's graviton, photon and dilaton. Substituting (1.3) and (1.6) in the action (1.4), integrating over y and retaining just the $n = 0$ terms we obtain (dropping the 0 subscripts)

$$I_4 = \frac{1}{2\kappa_4^2} \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} [R - \frac{1}{2} \partial_\mu \phi \partial^\mu \phi - \frac{1}{4} e^{-\sqrt{3}\phi} F_{\mu\nu} F^{\mu\nu}] \tag{1.9}$$

where $F_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu A_\nu - \partial_\nu A_\mu$ and $2\pi {\kappa_4}^2 = m\kappa_5^2$. Newton's constant is given by ${\kappa_4}^2 = 8\pi G$. This form of the action explains our choice of parameterization in (1.3): we obtain the usual Einstein-Hilbert term for gravity, the conventional Maxwell kinetic term for electromagnetism and the conventional Klein-Gordon term for the dilaton. Note, however, that we have normalized ϕ and A_μ so that $1/2{\kappa_4}^2$ is common to both gravity and matter terms. From (1.5), this action is invariant under general coordinate transformations with parameter ${\xi^\mu}_0$, i.e, (again dropping the 0 subscripts)

$$\delta g_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu \xi^\rho g_{\rho\nu} + \partial_\nu \xi^\rho g_{\mu\rho} + \xi^\rho \partial_\rho g_{\mu\nu}$$

$$\delta A_\mu = \partial_\mu \xi^\rho A_\rho + \xi^\rho \partial_\rho A_\mu$$

$$\delta \phi = \xi^\rho \partial_\rho \phi, \tag{1.10}$$

local gauge transformations with parameter ${\xi^4}_0$

$$\delta A_\mu = \partial_\mu \xi^4 \tag{1.11}$$

and global scale transformations with parameter λ

$$\delta A_\mu = \lambda A_\mu, \;\; \delta\phi = 2\lambda/\sqrt{3} \tag{1.12}$$

The symmetry of the vacuum, determined by the VEVs

$$\langle g_{\mu\nu}\rangle = \eta_{\mu\nu}, \;\; \langle A_\mu\rangle = 0, \;\; \langle\phi\rangle = \phi_0 \tag{1.13}$$

is the four-dimensional Poincare group $\times R$. Thus, the masslessness of the graviton is due to general covariance, the masslessness of the photon to gauge invariance, but the dilaton is massless because it is the Goldstone boson associated with the spontaneous breakdown of the global scale invariance. Note that the gauge group is R rather than $U(1)$ because this truncated $n = 0$ theory has lost all memory of the periodicity in y.

Now, however, let us include the $n \neq 0$ modes. An important observation is that the assumed topology of the ground state, namely $R^4 \times S^1$, restricts us to general coordinate transformations periodic in y. Whereas the general covariance (1.10) and local gauge invariance (1.11) simply correspond to the $n = 0$ modes of (1.5) respectively, the global scale invariance is no longer a symmetry because it corresponds to a rescaling

$$\delta g_{MN} = -\frac{1}{2}\lambda g_{MN} \tag{1.14}$$

combined with a general coordinate transformation

$$\xi^4 = -\lambda y/m \tag{1.15}$$

which is now forbidden by the periodicity requirement. The field ϕ is therefore merely a pseudo-Goldstone boson.

Just as ordinary general covariance may be regarded as the local gauge symmetry corresponding to the global Poincaré algebra and local gauge invariance as the gauge symmetry corresponding to the global abelian algebra, so the infinite parameter local transformations (1.8) correspond to an infinite-parameter global algebra with generators

$$P^\mu{}_n = e^{inmy}\partial^\mu$$

$$M^{\mu\nu}{}_n = e^{inmy}(x^\mu\partial^\nu - x^\nu\partial^\mu)$$

$$Q_n = ie^{inmy}\partial/\partial(my) \tag{1.16}$$

It is in fact a Kac-Moody-Virasoro generalization of the Poincaré/gauge algebra. Although this larger algebra describes a symmetry of the four-dimensional theory, the symmetry of

the vacuum determined by (1.13) is only Poincaré $\times U(1)$. Thus the gauge parameters $\xi^{\mu}{}_{n}$ and $\xi^{4}{}_{n}$ with $n \neq 0$ each correspond to spontaneously broken generators, and it follows that for $n \neq 0$ the fields $A_{\mu n}$ and ϕ_n are the corresponding Goldstone boson fields. The gauge fields $g_{\mu\nu n}$, with two degrees of freedom, will then each acquire a mass by absorbing the two degrees of freedom of each vector Goldstone boson $A_{\mu n}$ and the one degree of freedom of each scalar Goldstone boson ϕ_n to yield a pure spin 2 massive particle with five degrees of freedom. This accords with the observation that the massive spectrum is pure spin two. Thus we find an infinite tower of charged, massive spin 2 particles with charges e_n and masses m_n given by

$$e_n = n\sqrt{2}\kappa_4 m, \;\; m_n = |n|/R \tag{1.17}$$

where R is the radius of the S^1 given by $R^2m^2 = \langle g_{yy} \rangle$. Thus Klein explained (for the first time) the quantization of electric charge. (Note also that charge conjugation is just parity tranformation $y \to -y$ in the fifth dimension.) Of course, if we identify the fundamental unit of charge $e = \sqrt{2}\kappa_4 m$ with the charge on the electron, then we are forced to take m to be very large: the Planck mass $10^{19}\ GeV$, way beyond the range of any current or forseeable accelerator. This answers the second question left unanswered by Kaluza because with m very large, the radius of the circle must be very small: the Planck size $10^{-35}\ meters$, which satisfactorily accords with our everyday experience of living in four spacetime dimensions.[4]

It is interesting to note that, despite the inconsistency problems that arise in coupling a finite number of massive spin two particles to gravity and/or electromagnetism, Kaluza-Klein theory is consistent by virtue of having an *infinite* tower of such states. Any attempt to truncate to a finite non-zero number of massive modes would reintroduce the inconsistency. We also note, however, that these massive Kaluza-Klein modes have the unusual gyromagnetic ratio $g = 1$. Moreover, when we embed the theory in a superstring theory or M-theory, these Kaluza-Klein states will persist as a subset of the full string or M-theory spectrum. It is sometimes claimed that $g \neq 2$ leads to unacceptable high-energy behaviour for Compton scattering. However, although the classical value $g = 2$ is required in QED,

[4] A variation on the Kaluza-Klein theme is that our universe is a 3-brane embedded in a higher dimensional spacetime[208, 209, 210]. This is particularly compelling in the context of the Type IIB threebrane [211] since the worldvolume fields necessarily include gauge fields [58]. Thus the strong, weak and electromagnetic forces might be confined to the worldvolume of the brane while gravity propagates in the bulk. It has recently been suggested that, in such schemes, the extra dimensions might be much larger than 10^{-35} meters [212, 213] and may even be a large as a millimeter [214, 215, 216, 237]. In yet another variation, the brane occupies the boundary of AdS_5 and the extra fifth dimension is infinite [238]. Once again, the near horizon geometry of the $D3$-brane provides an example of this, as discussed in section 3.2.

the Standard Model, and indeed open string theory, this is not a universal rule. Tree level unitarity applies only in the energy regime $M_{Planck} > E > m/Q$ for a particle of mass m and charge Q, and this range is empty for Kaluza-Klein theory.

In summary, it seems that a five-dimensional world with one of its dimensions compactified on a circle is operationally indistinguishable from a four-dimensional world with a very particular (albeit infinite) mass spectrum.

1.3 The field content

Eleven is the maximum spacetime dimension in which one can formulate a consistent supersymmetric theory, as was first recognized by Nahm [37] in his classification of supersymmetry algebras. The easiest way to see this is to start in four dimensions and note that one supersymmetry relates states differing by one half unit of helicity. If we now make the reasonable assumption that there be no massless particles with spins greater than two, then we can allow up to a maximum of $N = 8$ supersymmetries taking us from helicity -2 through to helicity $+2$. Since the minimal supersymmetry generator is a Majorana spinor with four off-shell components, this means a total of 32 spinor components. A discussion of spinors and Dirac matrices in D spacetime dimensions may be found in the reprint volume of Salam and Sezgin [202]. Now in a spacetime with D dimensions and signature $(1, D-1)$, the maximum value of D admitting a 32 component spinor is $D = 11$. (Going to $D = 12$, for example, would require 64 components.) See Table 2[5]. Furthermore, as we shall see later, $D = 11$ emerges naturally as the maximum dimension admitting supersymmetric extended objects, without the need for any assumptions about higher spin. Not long after Nahm's paper, Cremmer, Julia and Scherk [200] realized that supergravity not only permits up to seven extra dimensions but in fact takes its simplest and most elegant form when written in its full eleven-dimensional glory. The unique $D = 11, N = 1$ supermultiplet is comprised of a graviton g_{MN}, a gravitino ψ_M and 3-form gauge field A_{MNP} with 44, 128 and 84 physical degrees of freedom, respectively. For a counting of on-shell degrees of freedom in higher dimensions, see Table 1. The theory may also be formulated in superspace. Ironically, however, these extra dimensions were not at first taken seriously but rather regarded merely as a useful device for deriving supergravities in four dimensions. Indeed $D = 4, N = 8$ supergravity was first obtained by Cremmer and Julia via the process of *dimensional reduction* i.e. by requiring that all the fields of $D = 11, N = 1$ supergravity be independent of the

[5]Conventions differ on how to count the supersymmetries and in later sections we follow the more usual convention [200] that $N_{max} = 8$ in $D = 5$ and in $N_{max} = 4$ $D = 7$

$D-bein$	${e_M}^A$	$D(D-3)/2$
$gravitino$	Ψ_M	$2^{(\alpha-1)}(D-3)$
$p-form$	$A_{M_1M_2\ldots M_p}$	$\begin{pmatrix} D-2 \\ p \end{pmatrix}$
$spinor$	χ	$2^{(\alpha-1)}$

Table 1: On-shell degrees of freedom in D dimensions. $\alpha = D/2$ if D is even, $\alpha = (D-1)/2$ if D is odd. We assume Majorana fermions and divide by two if the fermion is Majorana-Weyl. Similarly, we assume real bosons and divide by two if the tensor field strength is self-dual.

extra seven coordinates.

For many years the Kaluza-Klein idea of taking extra dimensions seriously was largely forgotten but the arrival of eleven-dimensional supergravity provided the missing impetus. The kind of four-dimensional world we end up with depends on how we *compactify* these extra dimensions: maybe seven of them would allow us to give a gravitational origin, à la Kaluza-Klein, to the strong and weak forces as well as the electromagnetic. In a very influential paper, Witten [217] drew attention to the fact that in such a scheme the four-dimensional gauge group is determined by the *isometry* group of the compact manifold $\mathcal{K}$. Moreover, he proved (what to this day seems to be merely a gigantic coincidence) that seven is not only the maximum dimension of $\mathcal{K}$ permitted by supersymmetry but the minimum needed for the isometry group to coincide with the standard model gauge group $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$.

In the early 80's there was great interest in four-dimensional N-extended supergravities for which the global $SO(N)$ is promoted to a gauge symmetry [8]. In these theories the underlying supersymmetry algebra is no longer Poincaré but rather anti-de Sitter (AdS_4) and the Lagrangian has a non-vanishing cosmological constant Λ proportional to the square of the gauge coupling constant g:

$$G\Lambda \sim -g^2 \tag{1.18}$$

where G is Newton's constant. The $N > 4$ gauged supergravities were particularly interesting since the cosmological constant Λ does not get renormalized [9] and hence the $SO(N)$ gauge symmetry has vanishing β-function[6]. The relation (1.18) suggested that there might

[6]For $N \leq 4$, the *beta* function (which receives a contribution from the spin 3/2 gravitinos) is positive and the pure supergravity theories are not asymptotically free. The addition of matter supermultiplets only makes the β function more positive [10] and hence gravitinos can never be confined. I am grateful to Karim

Dimension (D or d)	Minimal Spinor (M or m)	Supersymmetry (N or n)
11	32	1
10	16	2, 1
9	16	2, 1
8	16	2, 1
7	16	2, 1
6	8	4, 3, 2, 1
5	8	4, 3, 2, 1
4	4	8, ..., 1
3	2	16, ..., 1
2	1	32, ..., 1

Table 2: Minimal spinor components and supersymmetries.

be a Kaluza-Klein interpretation since in such theories the coupling constant of the gauge group arising from the isometries of the extra dimensions is given by

$$g^2 \sim Gm^2 \tag{1.19}$$

where m^{-1} is the size of the compact space. Moreover, there is typically a negative cosmological constant

$$\Lambda \sim -m^2 \tag{1.20}$$

Combining (1.19) and (1.20), we recover (1.18). Indeed, the maximal ($D = 4, N = 8$) gauged supergravity [11] was seen to correspond to the massless sector of ($D = 11, N = 1$) supergravity [12] compactified on an S^7 whose metric admits an $SO(8)$ isometry and 8 Killing spinors [13]. An important ingredient in these developments that had been insufficiently emphasized in earlier work on Kaluza-Klein theory was that the $AdS_4 \times S^7$ geometry was not fed in by hand but resulted from a *spontaneous compactification*, i.e. the vacuum state was obtained by finding a stable solution of the higher-dimensional field equations [14]. The mechanism of spontaneous compactification appropriate to the $AdS_4 \times S^7$ solution of eleven-dimensional supergravity was provided by the Freund-Rubin mechanism [15] in which the 4-form field strength in spacetime $F_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}$ ($\mu = 0, 1, 2, 3$) is proportional to the alternating symbol $\epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}$ [16]:

$$F_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} \sim \epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} \tag{1.21}$$

Benakli, Rene Martinez Acosta and Parid Hoxha for discussions on this point.

Compactification	**Supergroup**	**Bosonic subgroup**
$AdS_4 \times S^7$	$OSp(4\|8)$	$SO(3,2) \times SO(8)$
$AdS_5 \times S^5$	$SU(2,2\|4)$	$SO(4,2) \times SO(6)$
$AdS_7 \times S^4$	$OSp(6,2\|4)$	$SO(6,2) \times SO(5)$

Table 3: Compactifications and their symmetries.

Supergroup	**Supermultiplet**	**Field content**
$OSp(4\|8)$	$(n = 8, d = 3)$ singleton	8 scalars,8 spinors
$SU(2,2\|4)$	$(n = 4, d = 4)$ doubleton	1 vector,8 spinors,6 scalars
$OSp(6,2\|4)$	$((n_+, n_-) = (2,0), d = 6)$ tripleton	1 chiral 2-form,8 spinors,5 scalars

Table 4: Superconformal groups and their singleton, doubleton and tripleton repesentations.

A summary of this S^7 and other X^7 compactifications of $D = 11$ supergravity down to AdS_4 may be found in [20]. By applying a similar mechanism to the 7-form dual of this field strength one could also find compactifications on $AdS_7 \times S^4$ [17] whose massless sector describes gauged maximal $N = 4$, $SO(5)$ supergravity in $D = 7$ [18, 19]. Type IIB supergravity in $D = 10$, with its self-dual 5-form field strength, also admits a Freund-Rubin compactification on $AdS_5 \times S^5$ [23, 24, 25] whose massless sector describes gauged maximal $N = 8$ supergravity in $D = 5$ [26, 27].

In the three cases given above, the symmetry of the vacuum is described by the supergroups $OSp(4|8)$, $SU(2,2|4)$ and $OSp(6,2|4)$ for the S^7, S^5 and S^4 compactifications respectively, as shown in Table 3. Each of these groups is known to admit the so-called singleton, doubleton or tripleton[7] supermultiplets [28] as shown in Table 4. We recall that singletons are those strange representations of AdS first identified by Dirac [29] which admit no analogue in flat spacetime. They have been much studied by Fronsdal and collaborators [30, 31].

This Kaluza-Klein approach to $D = 11$ supergravity [204] eventually fell out of favor for three reasons. First, as emphasized by Witten [203], it is impossible to derive by the conventional Kaluza-Klein technique of compactifying on a manifold a *chiral theory*

[7] Our nomenclature is based on the AdS_4, AdS_5 and AdS_7 groups having ranks $2, 3$ and 4, respectively, and differs from that of Günaydin.

in four spacetime dimensions starting from a non-chiral theory such as eleven-dimensional supergravity. Ironically, Horava and Witten [102] were to solve this problem years later by compactifying on something that is not a manifold!. Secondly, in spite of its maximal supersymmetry and other intriguing features, eleven dimensional supergravity was, after all, still a *field theory* of gravity with all the attendant problems of non-renormalizability. For a recent discussion, see [246]. This problem also had to await the dawn of M-theory, since we now regard $D = 11$ supergravity not as a fundamental theory in its own right but the effective low-energy Lagrangian of M-theory. Thirdly, these AdS vacua necessarily have non-vanishing cosmological constant unless cancelled by fermion condensates [110]. and this was deemed unacceptable at the time. However, as we shall now describe, AdS is currently undergoing a renaissance thanks to the AdS/CFT correspondence.

1.4 The AdS/CFT correspondence

A by-product of M-theory has been the revival of anti-de Sitter space brought about by Maldacena's conjectured duality between physics in the bulk of AdS and a conformal field theory on the boundary [111]. In particular, M-theory on $AdS_4 \times S^7$ is dual to a non-abelian $(n = 8, d = 3)$ superconformal theory, Type IIB string theory on $AdS_5 \times S^5$ is dual to a $d = 4$ $SU(N)$ super Yang-Mills theory theory and M-theory on $AdS_7 \times S^4$ is dual to a non-abelian $((n_+, n_-) = (2, 0), d = 6)$ conformal theory. In particular, as has been spelled out most clearly in the $d = 4$ $SU(N)$ Yang-Mills case, there is seen to be a correspondence between the Kaluza-Klein mass spectrum in the bulk and the conformal dimension of operators on the boundary [123, 125]. This duality thus holds promise not only of a deeper understanding of M-theory, but may also throw light on non-perturbative aspects of the theories that live on the boundary which can include four-dimensional gauge theories. Models of this kind, where a bulk theory with gravity is equivalent to a boundary theory without gravity, have also been advocated by 't Hooft [131] and by Susskind [132] who call them *holographic* theories. The reader may notice a striking similarity to the earlier idea of "The membrane at the end of the universe"[38, 44, 39, 45, 46], whereby the p-brane occupies the $S^1 \times S^p$ boundary of AdS_{p+2} and is described by a superconformal singleton theory and to the "membrane/supergravity bootstrap" [38, 44, 39] which conjectured that the dynamics of the supergravity in the bulk of AdS was dictated by the membrane on its boundary and vice-versa. For example, one immediately recognises that the dimensions and supersymmetries of the three conformal theories in Maldacena's duality are exactly the same as the singleton, doubleton and tripleton supermultiplets of Table 3. Further

interconnections between the two are currently being explored. See [160, 141] and Section 5.4.

1.5 Plan of the lectures

The first purpose of these lectures will be to explain an area of research that was very active about ten years ago, namely anti-de Sitter space, the *Membrane at the End of the Universe*, singletons, superconformal theories, the *Membrane/Supergravity Bootstrap* and all that. These topics have recently undergone a revival of interest thanks to the the AdS/CFT conjecture of Maldacena [111] which suggests a duality between physics in the bulk of AdS and a superconformal theory on its boundary. We may thus regard this earlier work as a "prequel" (AdS/CFT Episode 1?). The second purpose is to discuss some very recent work on black holes in AdS which are interesting in their own right as well as finding application in the AdS/CFT correspondence. Both these topics will first require a thorough grounding in Kaluza-Klein theory, $D = 11$ supergravity, $D = 10$ Type IIB supergravity and $M2$, $D3$ and $M5$ branes.

In Section 2, we discuss the bosonic sector of $D = 11$ supergravity and those brane solutions (so called BPS branes) that preserve half of the supersymmetry: the supermembrane ($M2$-brane) and the superfivebrane ($M5$-brane). These solutions, together with the plane wave [56] and Kaluza-Klein monopole [222], which also preserve half the supersymmetry, are the progenitors of the lower dimensional BPS objects of M-theory.

In Section 3, we discuss the bosonic sector of Type IIB supergravity and the self-dual super threebrane ($D3$-brane) solution which also preserves one half of the supersymmetry.

These $M2$, $D3$ and $M5$ BPS branes may be regarded as the extremal mass=charge limit of more general two-parameter black brane solutions that exhibit event horizons. In the near-horizon limit, they tend respectively to the $AdS_4 \times S^7$, the $AdS_5 \times S^5$ and the $AdS_7 \times S^4$ vacua of the maximally supersymmetric $D = 4$, $D = 5$ and $D = 7$ gauged supergravities that correspond to the massless sector of the compactification of $D = 11$ supergravity on S^7, Type IIB supergravity on S^5 and $D = 11$ supergravity on S^4, respectively. These are also treated in Sections 2 and 3, as is the issue of consistent Kaluza-Klein truncation to the massless sector.

The zero modes of these three brane solutions are described by Green-Schwarz type covariant brane actions whose bosonic sectors are treated in Section 4. These will be crucial for Section 5, whose purpose will be to explain anti-de Sitter space, the membrane at the end of the universe, singletons, superconformal theories and the membrane/supergravity

bootstrap. In particular, by focussing on the bosonic radial mode, we show in detail how the superconformal singleton action on $S^1 \times S^2$ (including the scalar "mass term") follows from the action for a spherical $M2$ brane on the boundary of $AdS_4 \times S^7$ in the limit of large radius: the membrane at the end of the universe. (We also indicate, following [141] how this generalizes to generic branes with spherical topology but arbitrary geometry.) Then we compare and contrast these old results with the comparatively recent Maldacena conjecture. Since the AdS/CFT correspondence will be the subject matter of several other lecturers at this school, we shall not dwell on the implications of our results for this correspondence but simply present them as interesting in their own right.

As we have seen, these AdS spaces emerge as the vacua of the maximally supersymmetric $D = 4$, $D = 5$ and $D = 7$ gauged supergravities that correspond to the massless sector of the compactification of $D = 11$ supergravity on S^7, Type IIB supergravity on S^5 and $D = 11$ supergravity on S^4, respectively. Recently, therefore, black hole solutions of *gauged* supergravity have attracted a good deal of attention and these are the subject of Section 6

In [150], for example, new anti-de Sitter black hole solutions of gauged $N = 8$, $D = 4$, $SO(8)$ supergravity were presented. By focussing on the $U(1)^4$ Cartan subgroup, non-extremal 1, 2, 3 and 4 charge solutions were found. In the extremal limit, they may preserve up to 1/2, 1/4, 1/8 and 1/8 of the supersymmetry respectively. By contrast, the magnetic solutions preserve none. Since $N = 8$, $D = 4$ supergravity is a consistent truncation of $N = 1$, $D = 11$ supergravity, resulting from the S^7 compactification, it follows that these black holes will also be solutions of this theory. In [150], it was conjectured that a subset of the extreme electric black holes preserving 1/2 the supersymmetry may be identified with the S^7 Kaluza-Klein spectrum, with the non-abelian quantum numbers provided by the fermionic zero modes.

In [207] the non-linear Kaluza-Klein ansätze describing the embeddings of the $U(1)^4$, $U(1)^3$ and $U(1)^2$ truncations of these supergravities were presented, which admit 4-charge AdS_4, 3-charge AdS_5 and 2-charge AdS_7 black hole solutions. These enable us to embed the black hole solutions back in ten and eleven dimensions and reinterpret them as $M2$, $D3$ and $M5$ branes spinning in the transverse dimensions with the black hole charges given by the angular momenta of the branes. It is curious that the same $U(1)^4$, $U(1)^3$ and $U(1)^2$ black hole charges appear in these spherical compactifications as in the toroidal compactifications but for totally different reasons. Instead of arising from the intersection of different non-rotating branes, they arise from the different angular momenta of a single brane. This is indicative of deeper levels of duality yet to be uncovered.

At the end of each of these sections there are problems whose solutions may be found in Section 7.

Much of what we need to do in these lectures involves only the bosonic sectors of the supergravities and the branes. For completeness, however, a comprehensive Appendix lists the complete field equations, symmetries and transformation rules of $D = 11$ supergravity, Type IIB supergravity and the $M2$, $D3$ and $M5$ branes, with all the fermionic terms included.

Introductory treatments of supersymmetry and supergravity may be found in [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 243], of Kaluza-Klein theories in [217, 204, 205, 218, 202], of supermembranes in [38, 7, 47, 201, 219, 112], of M-theory in [101, 6, 103, 242] and of the AdS/CFT correspondence in [239, 221, 160].

1.6 Problems 1

1. Derive the four-dimensional action (1.9) by substituting (1.3) into the five-dimensional Einstein action (1.2) and assuming all fields are independent of the fifth coordinate y.

2. Derive the particle content of $(D = 4, N = 8)$ supergravity starting from $(D = 11, N = 1)$ supergravity.

2 ELEVEN DIMENSIONAL SUPERGRAVITY

2.1 Bosonic field equations

We will frequently seek solutions to the field equations of $D = 11$ supergravity in which all fermion fields are set equal to zero. The bosonic field equations following from Appendix A are

$$R_{MN} - \frac{1}{2}g_{MN}R = \frac{1}{12}\left(F_{MPQR}F_N{}^{PQR} - \frac{1}{8}g_{MN}F_{PQRS}F^{PQRS}\right), \tag{2.1}$$

and

$$\partial_M(\sqrt{-g}F^{MUVW}) + \frac{1}{1152}\epsilon^{UVWMNOPQRST}F_{MNOP}F_{QRST} = 0 \tag{2.2}$$

or, in the language of differential forms

$$d^*F + \frac{1}{2}F \wedge F = 0 \tag{2.3}$$

where $*$ denotes the Hodge dual.

2.2 $\mathbf{AdS}_4\times\ \mathbf{S}^7$

In this section, we examine the spontaneous compactification of $D = 11$ supergravity. We are interested in obtaining a four-dimensional theory which admits maximal spacetime symmetry. With signature $(-+++)$, this means that the vacuum should be invariant under $SO(4,1)$, Poincaré or $SO(3,2)$ according as the cosmological constant is positive, zero or negative, corresponding to de Sitter, Minkowski or anti-de Sitter space, respectively.

The first requirement of maximal symmetry is that the vev of any fermion field should vanish and accordingly we set

$$\langle \Psi_M \rangle = 0 \tag{2.4}$$

and focus our attention on vacuum solutions of the bosonic equations (2.1) and (2.2). We look for solutions of the direct product form $M_4 \times M_7$ compatible with maximal spacetime symmetry. We denote the spacetime coordinates by x^μ, $\mu = 0,1,2,3$ and the internal coordinates by y^m, $m = 1,\ldots,7$. The ansatz of Freund and Rubin [15] is to set

$$F_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} = \frac{3a}{2}\epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} \tag{2.5}$$

with all other components vanishing, where a is a real constant and the factor $3/2$ is chosen for future convenience. For future reference, it will prove convenient to rewrite this in terms of the dual field strength

$$F_7 \equiv *F_4 + \frac{1}{2}A_3 \wedge F_4 = 6L^6\epsilon_7 \tag{2.6}$$

where ϵ_7 is the volume form on the internal manifold, and where $L = 2/a$. At the moment, L is just an arbitrary constant of integration, but in Section 2.4 we shall relate it to the tension of an $M2$ brane. Substituting into the field equations we find that (2.2) is trivially satisfied while (2.1) yields the product of a four-dimensional Einstein spacetime

$$R_{\mu\nu} = -3a^2 g_{\mu\nu} = -\frac{12}{L^2}g_{\mu\nu} \tag{2.7}$$

with signature $(-+++)$ and seven-dimensional Einstein space

$$R_{mn} = \frac{3a^2}{2}g_{mn} = \frac{6}{L^2}g_{mn} \tag{2.8}$$

with signature $(+++++++)$.

For future reference we also record the form taken by the supercovariant derivative $\tilde{D}_M$ (2.36) when evaluated in the Freund-Rubin background geometry. First we decompose the $D = 11$ gamma matrices Γ_A

$$\Gamma_A = (\gamma_\alpha \otimes 1, \gamma_5 \otimes \Gamma_a) \tag{2.9}$$

where

$$\{\gamma_\alpha, \gamma_\beta\} = -2\eta_{\alpha\beta} \tag{2.10}$$

$$\{\Gamma_a, \Gamma_b\} = -2\delta_{ab} \tag{2.11}$$

and where $\alpha, \beta \ldots$ are spacetime idices for the tangent space group $SO(1,3)$ and $a, b, \ldots$ are the extra-dimensional indices for the tangent space group $SO(7)$. Substituting the Freund-Rubin ansatz into the covariant drivative we find that

$$\tilde{D}_\mu = D_\mu + \frac{1}{L}\gamma_\mu\gamma_5 \tag{2.12}$$

$$\tilde{D}_m = D_m - \frac{1}{2L}\Gamma_m \tag{2.13}$$

where $\gamma_\mu = e_\mu{}^\alpha\gamma_\alpha$ and $\Gamma_m = e_m{}^a\Gamma_a$.

Some comments are now in order. The constancy of a in the ansatz (2.5) is necessary to solve the field equations, but other ansätze are possible and are discussed in [20]. The maximally spacetime symmetric solution of (2.7) is, in fact, AdS_4 since the cosmological constant

$$\Lambda = -3a^2 \tag{2.14}$$

is negative. AdS_4 can be defined as the four-dimensional hyperboloid

$$\eta_{ab}y^a y^b = -\frac{1}{a^2} \tag{2.15}$$

in R^5 with Cartesian coordinates y^a, where

$$\eta_{ab} = diag(-1, 1, 1, 1, -1) \tag{2.16}$$

In polar coordinates $x^\mu = (t, r, \theta, \phi)$ the line element may be written

$$ds_4^2 = g_{\mu\nu}dx^\mu dx^\nu = -(1 + a^2r^2)dt^2 + (1 + a^2r^2)^{-1}dr^2 + r^2(d\theta^2 + \sin^2\theta d\phi^2) \tag{2.17}$$

It is sometimes useful to employ the change of variable

$$ar = \sinh\rho \tag{2.18}$$

for which

$$ds_4^2 = -\cosh^2\rho dt^2 + \frac{1}{a^2}d\rho^2 + \frac{1}{a^2}\sinh^2\rho(d\theta^2 + \sin^2\theta d\phi^2) \tag{2.19}$$

Representations of $SO(3,2)$ are denoted $D(E_0, s)$, where E_0 is the lowest energy eigenvalue (in units of a) and s is the total angular momentum. The representation is unitary provided $E_0 \geq s + 1/2$ for $s = 0, 1/2$ and $E_0 \geq s + 1$ for $s \geq 1$. The representations are

all infinite dimensional. Of course, in addition to being the AdS group in four dimensions, $SO(3,2)$ has the interpretation as the *conformal* group in three dimensions, where the quantum number E_0 plays the role of the conformal weight. This will prove significant in the AdS/CFT correspondence.

There are infinitely many seven-dimensional Einstein spaces M_7 satisfying (2.8) and we now turn to the question of how much unbroken supersymmetry survives. Recall from (2.4) that the vev of the gravitino has been set to zero. For a supersymmetric vacuum we require that it remain zero under a supersymmetry transformation (A.16)

$$\langle \delta\Psi_M \rangle = \langle \tilde{D}_M \epsilon \rangle = 0 \tag{2.20}$$

To solve this in the Freund-Rubin background, we look for solutions of the form

$$\epsilon(x,y) = \epsilon(x)\eta(y) \tag{2.21}$$

where $\epsilon(x)$ is an anticommuting four-component spinor in $D=4$ and $\eta(y)$ is a commuting eight-component spinor in $D=7$, satisfying

$$\tilde{D}_\mu \epsilon(x) = 0 \tag{2.22}$$

$$\tilde{D}_m \eta(y) = 0 \tag{2.23}$$

Thus the problem of counting unbroken supersymmetries is equivalent to the problem of counting *Killing spinors*. It is not dificult to establish that AdS_4 admits the maximum number (i.e. four) as far as spacetime is concerned, and so the number N of unbroken generators of AdS supersymmetry is given by the number of Killing spinors on M_7. From (2.13) these are seen to satisfy the integrability condition [69]

$$[\tilde{D}_m, \tilde{D}_n] = -\frac{1}{4} C_{mn}{}^{ab} \Gamma_{ab} \eta = 0 \tag{2.24}$$

where $C_{mn}{}^{ab}$ is the Weyl tensor. The subgroup of $Spin(7)$ (the double cover of the tangent space group $SO(7)$) generated by these linear combinations of the $Spin(7)$ generators Γ_{ab} corresponds to the *holonomy* group $\mathcal{H}$ of the generalized connection appearing in $\tilde{D}_m$. Thus the maximum number of unbroken supersymmetries N_{max} is equal to the number of spinors left invariant by $\mathcal{H}$. This in turn is given by the number of singlets appearing in the decomposition of the 8 of $Spin(7)$ under $\mathcal{H}$. For example, the squashed S^7 of [69, 70] has $\mathcal{H} = G_2$ and hence $N_{max} = 1$.

In the supersymmetric context, all linear irreducible representations of $N = 1$ AdS supersymmetry were classified by Heidenreich [32]. They fall into 4 classes:

1. $D(1/2,0) \oplus D(1,1/2)$
2. $D(E_0,0) \oplus D(E_0+1/2,1/2) \oplus D(E_0+1,0), E_0 \geq 1/2$
3. $D(s+1,s) \oplus D(s+3/2,s+1/2), s \geq 1/2$
4. $D(E_0,s) \oplus D(E_0+1/2,s+1/2) \oplus D(E_0+1/2,s-1/2) \oplus D(E_0+1,s)$.

Class 1 is the singleton supermultiplet which has no analogue in Poincaré supersymmetry. Singletons are the subject of Section 5. Class 2 is the Wess-Zumino supermultiplet. Class 3 is the gauge supermultiplet with spins s and $s+1/2$ with $s \geq 1/2$. Class 4 is the higher spin supermultiplet. The corresponding study of $OSp(4|N)$ representations was neglected in the literature until their importance in Kaluza-Klein supergravity became apparent. For example, the round S^7 leads to massive $N=8$ supermultiplets with maximum spin 2. This corresponds to an AdS type of multiplet shortening analogous to the shorteneing due to central charges in Poincaré supersymmetry [33]. Two features emerge: (1) $OSp(4|N)$ multiplets may be decomposed into the $OSp(4|1)$ multiplets discussed above; (2) In the limit as $a \to 0$ and the $OSp(4|N)$ contracts to the N-extended Poincaré algebra, all short AdS multiplets become massless Poincaré multiplets.

In this section we shall focus on the maximally symmetric round S^7, for which ${C_{mn}}^{ab} = 0$ yielding the maximum $N=8$ Killing spinors, and hence on the eleven-dimensional vacuum $AdS_4 \times S^7$. The Kaluza-Klein mechanism will give rise to an effective $D=4$ theory with $N=8$ supersymmetry and local $SO(8)$ invariance, describing a massless $N=8$ multiplet coupled to an infinite tower of massive $N=8$ supermultiplets with masses quantized in units of L^{-1}, the inverse radius of S^7. Combining the internal $SO(8)$ symmetry and $N=8$ supersymmetry with the $SO(2,3)$ of the AdS_4 spacetime, it is readily seen that the complete symmetry is $OSp(4|8)$. It follows without any further calculation that the massless sector on S^7 is given by the familiar massless $N=8$ supermultiplet consisting of (1 spin 2, 8 spin 3/2, 28 spin 1, 56 spin 1/2, 70 spin zero), but a calculation is required to see the $D=11$ origin of these fields, which is different from that of T^7. See Table 8.

2.3 Consistent truncation to the massless modes

An entirely different question is whether the massive modes can be consistently truncated to yield just gauged $N=8$ supergravity. A *consistent truncation* is defined to be one for which all solutions of the truncated theory are solutions of the original theory. It requires that the truncated fields must never appear linearly in the action, otherwise setting them to zero would result in further constraints on the massless modes over and above the equations of motion of the massless theory [164, 161, 162, 165]. Interestingly enough, for generic

Kaluza-Klein theories, truncation to the massless sector is *not* consistent. To illustrate this, consider the field equations of pure gravity with a positive cosmological constant Λ in $D = 4 + k$ dimensions

$$\hat{R}_{MN} = \Lambda \hat{g}_{MN} \tag{2.25}$$

This theory admits the ground-state solution of ($D = 4$ de Sitter spacetime) $\times$ (compact manifold M_k). In some earlier Kaluza-Klein literature, it was generally believed that the correct ansatz for the metric $\hat{g}_{MN}(x, y)$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{g}_{\mu\nu}(x, y) &= g_{\mu\nu}(x) + A_\mu{}^i K^{mi}(y)(x) A_\nu{}^j(x) K^{nj}(y) g_{mn}(y) \\ \hat{g}_{\mu n}(x, y) &= A_\mu{}^i(x) K^{mi}(y) g_{mn}(y) \\ \hat{g}_{mn}(x, y) &= g_{mn}(y) \end{aligned} \tag{2.26}$$

where $\hat{g}_{mn}(y)$ is the metric on M_k. The quantities $K^{mi}(y)$ are the Killing vectors corresponding to the isometries of this metric and i runs over the dimension of the isometry group G. The claim that this is the correct ansatz was based on the observation that substituting this ansatz into the higher-dimensional Einstein action and integrating over y, one obtains the four-dimensional Einstein-Yang-Mills action with metric $g_{\mu\nu}(x)$ and gauge potential $A_\mu{}^i(x)$.

However, the correct Kaluza-Klein ansatz must be consistent with the higher dimensional field equations and, as we shall now demonstrate, this is not in general true. For example, the four-dimensional Einstein equations read

$$R_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2} g_{\mu\nu} + \Lambda g_{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{2}(F_{\mu\nu}{}^i F_\nu{}^{\rho j} - \frac{1}{4} F_{\rho\sigma}{}^i F^{\rho\sigma j}) K_n{}^i K^{nj} \tag{2.27}$$

where $F_{\mu\nu}{}^i$ is the Yang-Mills field strength. The inconsistency is now apparent. The left-hand side is independent of y while the right-hand side in general depends on y via the Killing vector combination $K_n{}^i K^{nj}$. For example, when $M_k = S^k$ with its $SO(k + 1)$ invariant metric.

$$K_n{}^i K^{nj} = \delta_{ij} + Y^{ij}(y) \tag{2.28}$$

where $Y^{ij}(y)$ is that harmonic of the scalar Laplacian with next to lowest non-vanishing eigenvalue $2\Lambda(k + 1)/(k - 1)$ belonging to the $k(k + 3)/2$ dimensional representation of $SO(k + 1)$.

This situation changes radically when we turn to the S^7 compactification $D = 11$ supergravity. The reason for the difference is the presence of the three-index gauge field $\hat{A}_{MNP}$

in addition to the metric $\hat{g}_{MN}$. The crucial observation is that the standard Kaluza-Klein ansatz (2.26) must be augmented by the additional ansatz [13, 164]

$$\hat{F}_{\mu\nu pq} = -\frac{1}{2a}\epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}F^{\rho\sigma i}\nabla_{[p}K_{q]}{}^{i} \tag{2.29}$$

Substituting (2.26) and (2.29) into the $D = 11$ field equations (2.1) and (2.2) now yields the $D = 4$ Einstein equation

$$R_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2}g_{\mu\nu} + \Lambda g_{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{2}(F_{\mu\nu}{}^{i}F_{\nu}{}^{\rho j} - \frac{1}{4}F_{\rho\sigma}{}^{i}F^{\rho\sigma j})(K_{n}{}^{i}K^{nj} + \frac{1}{a^2}\nabla_m K_n{}^{i}\nabla^m K^{ni}) \tag{2.30}$$

The miracle of the S^7 compactification is that

$$K_n{}^{i}K^{nj} + \frac{1}{a^2}\nabla_m K_n{}^{i}\nabla^m K^{ni} = \delta^{ij} \tag{2.31}$$

and so the right-hand side of (2.30) becomes the correct energy-momentum tensor of $SO(8)$ Yang-Mills! Indeed the round S^7 is the only M_7 solution of (2.8) known to satisfy (2.31).

2.4 The supermembrane solution

Historically, the equations of motion of $D = 11$ supergravity were written down in 1978 [200] and the $D = 11$ supermembrane was discovered as a fundamental object in its own right in 1987 [41, 42]. In 1990, however, it was realized [51] that the $D = 11$ supermembrane arises as a classical solution of the supergravity field equations which preserves one half of the spacetime supersymmetry. We shall now describe this solution.

We begin by making an ansatz for the $D = 11$ gauge fields $g_{MN} = e_M{}^A e_N{}^B \eta_{AB}$ and A_{MNP} corresponding to the most general three-eight split invariant under $P_3 \times SO(8)$, where P_3 is the $D = 3$ Poincaré group. We split the $D = 11$ coordinates

$$x^M = (x^\mu, y^m) \tag{2.32}$$

where $\mu = 0, 1, 2$ and $m = 3, 4, \ldots, 10$, and write the line element as

$$ds^2 = e^{2A}\eta_{\mu\nu}dx^\mu dx^\nu + e^{2B}\delta_{mn}dx^m dx^n \tag{2.33}$$

and the 3-form gauge field as

$$A_{012} = e^C \tag{2.34}$$

All other components of A_{MNP} and all components of the gravitino Ψ_M are set equal to zero. P_3 invariance requires that the arbitrary functions A, B and C depend only on y^m; $SO(8)$ invariance then requires that this dependence be only through $y = \sqrt{\delta_{mn}y^m y^n}$.

As we shall show, the three arbitrary functions A, B, and C are reduced to one by the requirement that the field configuration (2.33) and (2.34) preserve some unbroken supersymmetry. In other words, there must exist Killing spinors ϵ satisfying

$$\tilde{D}_M \epsilon = 0 \tag{2.35}$$

where $\tilde{D}_M$ is the bosonic part of the supercovariant derivative appearing in the supersymmetry transformation rule of the gravitino (A.18)

$$\tilde{D}_M = \partial_M + \frac{1}{4}\omega_M{}^{AB}\Gamma^{AB} - \frac{1}{288}(\Gamma_M{}^{PQRS} - 8\delta_M{}^P\Gamma^{QRS})F_{PQRS} \tag{2.36}$$

We make the three-eight split

$$\Gamma^A = (\gamma_\alpha \otimes \Gamma_9, \mathbf{1} \otimes \Sigma_a) \tag{2.37}$$

where γ_α and Σ_a are the $D = 3$ and $D = 8$ Dirac matrices respectively and where

$$\Gamma_9 = \Sigma_3\Sigma_4 \ldots \Sigma_{10} \tag{2.38}$$

so that ${\Gamma_9}^2 = 1$. We also decompose the spinor field as

$$\epsilon(x, y) = \zeta(x) \otimes \eta(y) \tag{2.39}$$

where ζ is a constant spinor of $SO(1, 2)$ and η is an $SO(8)$ spinor which may further be decomposed into chiral eigenstates via the projection operators $(1 + \Gamma_9)/2$.

In our background (2.33) and (2.34), the supercovariant derivative becomes:

$$\tilde{D}_\mu = \partial_\mu - \gamma_\mu \frac{1}{2}\Sigma^m \partial_m A \Gamma_9 - \gamma_\mu e^{-3A}\Sigma^m \partial_m e^C,$$

$$\tilde{D}_m = \partial_m + \frac{1}{4}e^{-B}(\Sigma_m\Sigma^n - \Sigma^n\Sigma_m)\partial_n e^B - \frac{1}{24}e^{-3A}(\Sigma_m\Sigma^n - \Sigma^n\Sigma_m)\partial_n e^C\Gamma_9 + \frac{1}{6}e^{-3A}\partial_m e^C\Gamma_9 \tag{2.40}$$

Note that the Γ_μ and Σ_m carry world indices. Hence we find that (2.35) admits two non-trivial solutions

$$(1 + \Gamma_9)\eta = 0 \tag{2.41}$$

where

$$\eta = e^{C/6}\eta_0 \tag{2.42}$$

where η_0 is a constant spinor and

$$A = \frac{1}{3}C$$
$$B = -\frac{1}{6}C + constant \tag{2.43}$$

In each case, (2.41) means that one half of the maximal possible supersymmetry survives.

With the substitutions (2.33), (2.34) and (2.43), the Einstein equation and the 3-form equation reduce to the single equation for one unknown:

$$\delta^{mn}\partial_m\partial_n e^{-C} = 0 \tag{2.44}$$

and hence, imposing the boundary condition that the metric be asymptotically Minkowskian, we find

$$e^{-C} = 1 + \frac{b^6}{y^6} \tag{2.45}$$

where b is a constant, at this stage arbitrary, and $y^2 = \delta_{mn}y^m y^n$. Thus the metric is given by

$$ds^2 = (1 + b^6/y^6)^{-2/3}dx^\mu dx_\mu + (1 + b^6/y^6)^{1/3}(dy^2 + y^2 d\Omega_7{}^2) \tag{2.46}$$

and the 7-form field strength by

$$F_7 \equiv *F_4 + \frac{1}{2}A_3 \wedge F_4 = 6b^6\epsilon_7 \tag{2.47}$$

Here ϵ_7 is the volume form on S^7 and Ω_7 is the volume. The mass per unit area of the membrane $\mathcal{M}_3$ is given by:

$$\kappa_{11}{}^2\mathcal{M}_3 = 3b^6\Omega_7 \tag{2.48}$$

This *elementary* solution is a singular solution of the supergravity equations coupled to a supermembrane source and carries a Noether "electric" charge

$$Q = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}\kappa_{11}}\int_{S^7} F_7 = \sqrt{2}\kappa_{11}\mathcal{M}_3 \tag{2.49}$$

Hence the solution saturates the Bogomol'nyi-Prasad-Sommerfield (BPS) bound

$$\sqrt{2}\kappa_{11}\mathcal{M}_3 \geq Q. \tag{2.50}$$

This is a consequence of the preservation of half the supersymmetries. Of course, the equation (2.44) displays a delta-function singularity at the origin and hence requires a source term. This is provided by adding to the supergravity action (A.1) the action of the supermembrane itself [51], discussed in Section 4.1. We find, as expected, that the mass per unit volume $\mathcal{M}_3$ is just the membrane tension T_3

$$\mathcal{M}_3 = T_3 \tag{2.51}$$

The zero modes of this solution belong to a $(d = 3, n = 8)$ supermultiplet consisting of eight scalars and eight spinors (ϕ^I, χ^I), with $I = 1, ..., 8$, which correspond to the eight

Goldstone bosons and their superpartners associated with breaking of the eight translations transverse to the membrane worldvolume.

A straightforward generalization to exact, stable multimembrane configurations can be obtained by replacing the single membrane expression (2.45) by a linear superposition

$$e^{-C} = 1 + \sum_l \frac{{b_l}^6}{|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{y}_l|^6} \tag{2.52}$$

where $\mathbf{y}_l$ corresponds to the position of each brane, each with charge ${b_l}^6$. The ability to superpose solutions of this kind is a well-known phenomenon in soliton and instanton physics and goes by the name of the "no-static-force condition". In the present context, it means that the gravitational attractive force acting on each of the branes is exactly cancelled by an equal but repulsive force due to the 3-form. This condition is closely related to the saturation of the BPS bound and to the existence of unbroken supersymmetry. In the case that N branes with the same charge are stacked together, we have

$$e^{-C} = 1 + \frac{Nb^6}{y^6} \tag{2.53}$$

or in terms of the Schwarzschild-like coordinate r given by

$$r^6 = y^6 + Nb^6 \tag{2.54}$$

we have

$$e^{C} = 1 - \frac{Nb^6}{r^6} \tag{2.55}$$

and the solution exhibits an event-horizon at $r = N^{1/6}b$. Indeed the solution may be analytically continued down to $r = 0$ where there is a curvature singularity, albeit hidden by the event horizon [65]. Of particular interest is now the near horizon limit $y \to 0$, or equivalently the large N limit, because then the metric reduces to [64, 65, 66] the $AdS_4 \times S^7$ vacuum of Section 2.2 with

$$L^6 = Nb^6 \tag{2.56}$$

Thus

$$ds^2 = \frac{y^4}{L^4} dx^\mu dx_\mu + \frac{L^2}{y^2} dy^2 + L^2 d\Omega_7{}^2 \tag{2.57}$$

which is just $AdS_4 \times S^7$ with the AdS metric written in horospherical coordinates.

2.5 $\mathbf{AdS_7 \times S^4}$

In this section, we are interested in obtaining a seven-dimensional theory which admits maximal AdS spacetime symmetry. With signature $(- + + + + + +)$, this means that the

vacuum should be invariant under $SO(6,2)$. We again look for solutions of the direct product form $M_7 \times M_4$ compatible with maximal spacetime symmetry. We denote the spacetime coordinates by x^μ, $(\mu = 0, \ldots, 6)$ and the internal coordinates by y^m, $(m = 1, \ldots, 4)$. The ansatz of Freund and Rubin [15] is to set

$$F_4 = 3L^2 \epsilon_4 \tag{2.58}$$

with all other components vanishing, where L is a real constant. Here ϵ_4 is the volume form on the internal manifold. As before, L is just an arbitrary constant of integration, but in Section 2.6 we shall relate it to the tension of an $M5$-brane. Substituting into the field equations we find that (2.2) is trivially satisfied while (2.1) yields the product of a seven-dimensional Einstein spacetime

$$R_{\mu\nu} = -\frac{3}{2L^2} g_{\mu\nu} \tag{2.59}$$

with signature $(-++++++)$ and four-dimensional Einstein space

$$R_{mn} = \frac{3}{L^2} g_{mn} \tag{2.60}$$

with signature $(++++)$.

The maximally spacetime symmetric solution of (2.59) is AdS_7. In these lectures, we shall focus also on the maximally symmetric round S^4 solution of (2.60). The Kaluza-Klein mechanism will give rise to an effective $D = 7$ theory with $N = 4$ supersymmetry and local $SO(5)$ invariance, describing a massless $N = 4$ multiplet coupled to an infinite tower of massive $N = 4$ supermultiplets with masses quantized in units of $2a$, the inverse radius of S^4. Combining the internal $SO(5)$ symmetry and $N = 4$ supersymmetry with the $SO(6,2)$ of the AdS_7 spacetime, it is readily seen that the complete symmetry is $OSp(6,2|4)$. It follows without any further calculation that the massless sector on S^7 is given by the massless $N = 4$ supergravity supermultiplet, and there indeed exists a consistent truncation to the massless sector [223, 224].

2.6 The superfivebrane solution

The superfivebrane was discovered as a soliton solution of $D = 11$ supergravity also preserving half the spacetime supersymmetry [62]. Now we make the six/five split $x^M = (x^\mu, y^m)$ where $\mu = 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5$ and $m = 6, ..., 10$ and proceed in a way similar to the supermembrane solution. In particular, we again look for solutions preserving supersymmetry but this time we look for a non-vanishing *magnetic* charge carried by F_4 :

$$F_4 = 3b^3 \epsilon_4 \tag{2.61}$$

The metric is given by

$$ds^2 = (1 + b^3/y^3)^{-1/3} dx^\mu dx_\mu + (1 + b^3/y^3)^{2/3}(dy^2 + y^2 d\Omega_4{}^2) \tag{2.62}$$

where the fivebrane mass per unit 5-volume $\mathcal{M}_6$, which we identify with the fivebrane tension T_6, is related to the constant b^3 by

$$b^3 = \frac{2\kappa_{11}{}^2 \mathcal{M}_6}{3\Omega_4} \tag{2.63}$$

Here ϵ_4 is the volume form on S^4 and Ω_4 is the volume. This *solitonic* solution is a non-singular solution of the source-free equations and carries a topological "magnetic" charge

$$P = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}\kappa_{11}} \int_{S^4} F_4 = \sqrt{2}\kappa_{11}\mathcal{M}_6 \tag{2.64}$$

Hence the solution saturates the Bogomol'nyi bound

$$\sqrt{2}\kappa_{11}\mathcal{M}_6 \geq P \tag{2.65}$$

Once again, this is a consequence of the preservation of half the supersymmetries. The soliton zero modes are described by the chiral antisymmetric tensor multiplet $(B^-{}_{\mu\nu}, \lambda^I, \phi^{[IJ]})$. Note that in addition to the five scalars corresponding to the five translational Goldstone bosons, there is also a 2-form $B^-{}_{\mu\nu}$ whose 3-form field strength is anti-self-dual and which describes three degrees of freedom.

The electric and magnetic charges obey a Dirac quantization rule

$$QP = 2\pi n \qquad n = \text{integer} \tag{2.66}$$

Or, in terms of the tensions,

$$2\kappa_{11}{}^2 T_3 T_6 = 2\pi n \tag{2.67}$$

This naturally suggests a $D = 11$ membrane/fivebrane duality. Note that this reduces the three dimensionful parameters T_3, T_6 and κ_{11} down to two. Moreover, it can be shown [99] that they are not independent. To see this, we note from Appendix C that A_3 has period $2\pi/T_3$ so that F_4 is quantized according to

$$\int F_4 = \frac{2\pi n}{T_3} \quad n = integer \tag{2.68}$$

Consistency of such A_3 periods with the spacetime action, (A.1), gives the relation

$$\frac{(2\pi)^2}{\kappa_{11}{}^2 T_3^3} \in 2Z \tag{2.69}$$

From (2.67), this may also be written as

$$2\pi \frac{T_6}{{T_3}^2} \in Z \tag{2.70}$$

Thus the tension of the singly charged fivebrane is given by

$$T_6 = \frac{1}{2\pi} {T_3}^2 \tag{2.71}$$

In problem 3.4, you are asked to show that a derivation [101] based on M/IIB duality gives the same result [220].

As for the membrane, multifivebrane solutions may be obtained by superposition. If we again consider N singly charged fivebranes stacked one upon the other, we find in the near horizon, or large N, limit the $AdS_7 \times S^4$ geometry with

$$L^3 = Nb^3 \tag{2.72}$$

namely

$$ds^2 = \frac{y}{L} dx^\mu dx_\mu + \frac{L^2}{y^2} dy^2 + L^2 d{\Omega_4}^2 \tag{2.73}$$

2.7 Problems 2

1. Derive the bosonic field equations (2.1) and (2.2) by varying the $D = 11$ supergravity action (A.1).

2. Prove that the $D = 11$ superfivebrane preserves one half of the supersymmetry.

3 TYPE IIB SUPERGRAVITY

3.1 Bosonic field equations

Next we consider Type IIB supergravity in $D = 10$ [21, 22] which also describes 128 + 128 degrees of freedom, and corresponds to the field-theory limit of the Type IIB superstring. The spectrum of the supergravity theory consists of a complex scalar B, a complex spinor λ, a complex 2-form A_{MN}, a complex Weyl gravitino ψ_M, a real graviton ${e_M}^R$ and a real 4-form A_{MNPQ} whose 5-form field strength F_{MNPQR} obeys a self-duality condition. Owing to this self-duality , there exists no covariant action principle and it is therefore simplest to work directly with the field equations. Once again, it is convenient to isolate just the bosonic field equations following from Appendix B which read

$$D^M P_M = \frac{1}{24} {\kappa_{10}}^2 G_{MNP} G^{MNP} \tag{3.1}$$

$$D^P G_{MNP} = P^P {G^*}_{MNP} - \frac{2}{3} i \kappa_{10} F_{MNPQR} G^{*PQR} \tag{3.2}$$

$$R_{MP} - \frac{1}{2} g_{MP} R = P_M {P^*}_P + {P^*}_M P_P - g_{MP} P^R {P^*}_R + \frac{1}{6} {\kappa_{10}}^2 F_{R_1 \ldots R_4 M} F^{R_1 \ldots R_4}{}_P \tag{3.3}$$

$$+ \frac{1}{8} {\kappa_{10}}^2 (G_M{}^{RS} {G^*}_{PRS} + {G^*}_M{}^{RS} G_{PRS}) - \frac{1}{24} {\kappa_{10}}^2 g_{MP} G^{RST} {G^*}_{RST} \tag{3.4}$$

$$F_{MNPQR} = *F_{MNPQR} \tag{3.5}$$

where

$$P_M = f^2 \partial_M B \tag{3.6}$$

$$G_{MNP} = f(F_{MNP} - B {F^*}_{MNP}) \tag{3.7}$$

$$F_{MNP} = 3 \partial_{[M} A_{NP]} \tag{3.8}$$

$$f = (1 - B^* B)^{-1/2} \tag{3.9}$$

$$F_{MNPQR} = 5 \partial_{[M} A_{NPQR]} - \frac{5}{4} \kappa_{10} \mathrm{Im}(A_{[MN} {F^*}_{PQR]}) \tag{3.10}$$

Our notation is that X^* is the complex conjugate of X while $*X$ is the Hodge dual of X.

3.2 $\mathbf{AdS}_5 \times \mathbf{S}^5$

In this section, we are interested in obtaining a five-dimensional theory which admits maximal AdS spacetime symmetry. With signature $(-++++)$, this means that the vacuum should be invariant under $SO(4,2)$. We again look for solutions of the direct product form $M_5 \times M_5'$ compatible with maximal spacetime symmetry. We denote the spacetime coordinates by x^μ, $(\mu = 0, \ldots, 4)$ and the internal coordinates by y^m, $(m = 1, \ldots, 5)$. The ansatz of Freund and Rubin [15] is to set

$$F_5 = G_5 + *G_5 \tag{3.11}$$

and

$$G_5 = 4 L^4 \epsilon_5 \tag{3.12}$$

with all other components vanishing, where L is a real constant. Here ϵ_5 is the volume form on the internal manifold. As before, L is just an arbitrary constant of integration, but in Section 3.3, we shall relate it to the tension of an $D3$-brane. Substituting into the field equations we find that (2.2) is trivially satisfied while (2.1) yields the product of a five-dimensional Einstein spacetime

$$R_{\mu\nu} = -\frac{4}{L^2} g_{\mu\nu} \tag{3.13}$$

with signature $(-++++)$ and five-dimensional Einstein space

$$R_{mn} = \frac{4}{L^2} g_{mn} \tag{3.14}$$

with signature $(+++++)$.

The maximally spacetime symmetric solution of (3.13) is AdS_5. In these lectures, we shall focus also on the maximally symmetric round S^5 solution of (3.14). The Kaluza-Klein mechanism will give rise to an effective $D = 5$ theory with $N = 8$ supersymmetry and local $SO(6)$ invariance, describing a massless $N = 8$ multiplet coupled to an infinite tower of massive $N = 8$ supermultiplets with masses quantized in units of a, the inverse radius of S^5. Combining the internal $SO(6)$ symmetry and $N = 8$ supersymmetry with the $SO(2, 4)$ of the AdS_5 spacetime, it is readily seen that the complete symmetry is $SU(2, 2|4)$. It follows without any further calculation that the massless sector on S^5 is given by the massless $N = 8$ supergravity supermultiplet. To date, however, the proof of a complete consistent truncation to the massless sector is still lacking.

3.3 The self-dual superthreebrane solution

The resulting field equations admit as a solution the self-dual threebrane [57] which in the extremal limit preserves half the supersymmetry [58] just like the extremal 2-brane and 5-brane of $D = 11$ supergravity. We need keep only the graviton, dilaton and 4-form and make the four/six split $x^M = (x^\mu, y^m)$ where $\mu = 0, 1, 2, 3$ and $m = 5, \ldots, 10$. The solution is given by

$$ds^2 = (1 + b^4/y^4)^{-1/2} dx^\mu dx_\mu + (1 + b^4/y^4)^{1/2} (dy^2 + y^2 d\Omega_5{}^2) \tag{3.15}$$

$$e^{2\phi} = e^{2\phi_0} = constant \tag{3.16}$$

$$F_5 = G_5 + *G_5 \tag{3.17}$$

where

$$G_5 = 4b^4 \epsilon_5 \tag{3.18}$$

Here we have employed the string frame metric $g_{MN}(string) = e^{\phi/2} g_{MN}(Einstein)$. The threebrane mass per unit volume $\mathcal{M}_4$ is then related to the tension T_4 by [7]

$$\mathcal{M}_4 = e^{-\phi_0} T_4 \tag{3.19}$$

and related to the constant k_4 by

$$b^4 = \frac{2\kappa_{10}{}^2 \mathcal{M}_4}{\Omega_5} \tag{3.20}$$

It is perhaps worth saying a few more words about the self-duality of the superthreebrane. By virtue of the self-duality condition (3.5), the electric Noether charge

$$Q = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}\kappa_{10}} \int_{S^5} * F_5 \tag{3.21}$$

coincides with the topological magnetic charge

$$P = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}\kappa_{10}} \int_{S^5} F_5 \tag{3.22}$$

so

$$Q = P \tag{3.23}$$

and hence

$$2\kappa_{10}^2 {\mathcal{M}_4}^2 = 2\pi n \tag{3.24}$$

(Note that such a condition is possible only in theories allowing a real self-duality condition i.e. in $D = 2$ modulo 4 dimensions, assuming Minkowski signature. The $D = 6$ self-dual string of [72] is another example.)

We can also count bosonic and fermionic zero modes. We know that one half of the supersymmetries are broken, hence we have 16 fermionic zero modes. Regrouping these 16 fermionic zero modes, we get four Majorana spinors in $d = 4$. Hence the $d = 4$ worldvolume supersymmetry is $N = 4$. Worldvolume supersymmetry implies that the number of fermionic and bosonic on-shell degrees of freedom must be equal, so we need a total of eight bosonic zero modes. There are the usual six bosonic translation zero modes, but we are still short of two. The two extra zero modes come from the excitation of the complex antisymmetric field strength G_{MNP} and correspond to a real vector field on the worldvolume [58]. Together with the other zero modes, these fields make up the $d = 4, N = 4$ gauge supermultiplet $(A_\mu, \lambda^I, \phi^{[IJ]})$.

As for the membrane and fivebrane, multithreebrane solutions may be obtained by superposition. If we again consider N singly charged threebranes stacked one upon the other, we find in the near horizon, or large N, limit the $AdS_7 \times S^4$ geometry with

$$L^4 = Nb^4 \tag{3.25}$$

namely

$$ds^2 = \frac{y^2}{L^2} dx^\mu dx_\mu + \frac{L^2}{y^2} dy^2 + L^2 {d\Omega_5}^2 \tag{3.26}$$

3.4 Problems 3

1. Show, using the duality between M-theory on T^2 and Type IIB theory on S^1, that the M-theory membrane tension T_3 and the M-theory fivebrane tension T_6 are related by
$$T_6 = \frac{1}{2\pi} {T_3}^2 \tag{3.27}$$
2. Write down the dictionary that relates the fields of M-theory on T^2 to IIB on S^1.

4 THE M2-BRANE, D3-BRANE AND M5-BRANE

4.1 The M2-brane

The $8+8$ zero modes of the $M2$-brane are described by a supersymmetric 2+1 dimensional worldvolume action. However, this obscures the underlying $D = 11$ spacetime supersymmetry. It is possible to construct a covariant action with the scalars and spinors being given by the 11 bosonic coordinates X^M and the 32 fermionic coordinates θ^α of a $D = 11$ superspace [41, 42]. Indeed, in the case of the $M2$ brane this came first. The $8+8$ physical degrees of freedom, and the worldvolume supersymmetry then emerge by going to a physical gauge, as discussed in Section 5.2. We begin with the bosonic sector of the $d = 3$ worldvolume of the $D = 11$ supermembrane which follows from Appendix C:
$$S_3 = T_3 \int d^3\xi \Big[-\frac{1}{2}\sqrt{-\gamma}\gamma^{ij}\partial_i x^M \partial_j x^N g_{MN}(x) + \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{-\gamma} + \frac{1}{3!}\epsilon^{ijk}\partial_i x^M \partial_j x^N \partial_k x^P A_{MNP}(x) \Big] , \tag{4.1}$$
where T_3 is the membrane tension, ξ^i $(i = 0, 1, 2)$ are the worldvolume coordinates, γ^{ij} is the worldvolume metric and $x^M(\xi)$ are the spacetime coordinates $(M = 0, 1, \ldots, 10)$. Kappa symmetry, discussed in Appendix C, demands that the background metric g_{MN} and background 3-form potential A_{MNP} obey the classical field equations of $D = 11$ supergravity (2.1) and (2.2).

Varying (4.1) with respect to x^M yields
$$\partial_i(\sqrt{-\gamma}\gamma^{ij}\partial_j x^N g_{MN}) - \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{-\gamma}\gamma^{ij}\partial_i x^N \partial_j x^P \partial_M g_{NP} + \frac{1}{3!}\epsilon^{ijk}\partial_i x^N \partial_j x^P \partial_k x^Q F_{MNPQ} = 0 \tag{4.2}$$
while varying with respect to γ_{ij} yields the embedding equation
$$\gamma_{ij} = \partial_i x^M \partial_j x^N g_{MN} \tag{4.3}$$

An important issue is the existence of membrane configurations preserving some supersymmetry [44, 45]. We usually seek supersymmetric membrane vacuum states for which

both the spacetime gravitino Ψ_M and the fermionic coordinates $\theta(\xi)$ are zero, so that the membrane action reduces to (4.1). In this case, the criterion for surviving supersymmetry is that the vacuum expectation values of Ψ_M and $\theta(\xi)$ remain zero under some appropriate combination of κ symmetry and supersymmetry transformations. We shall work to linear order in fermions, which is as high as we need go to investigate the supersymmetry of a purely bosonic background. From Appendices A and C, these transformations rules are

$$\delta\Psi_M = \tilde{D}_M\epsilon(x) \tag{4.4}$$

$$\delta\theta = (1+\Gamma)\kappa(\xi) + \epsilon(x) \tag{4.5}$$

where ϵ and κ are the supersymmetry and κ symmetry parameters, respectively. Here $\tilde{D}_M$ is the $D = 11$ supercovariant derivative (2.36) and Γ is given by

$$\Gamma = \frac{1}{3!}\sqrt{-\gamma}\epsilon^{ijk}\partial_i x^M \partial_j x^N \partial_k x^P \Gamma_{MNP} \tag{4.6}$$

As a consequence of the embedding equation (4.3), Γ satisfies $\Gamma^2 = 1$. Since Γ is tracefree, this implies that $(1 \pm \Gamma)/2$ are projection operators with 16 zero eigenvalues. Irrespective of the background geometry the κ symmetry may therefore be used to set 16 of the 32 components of θ to zero. A convenient choice is

$$(1+\Gamma)\theta = 0 \tag{4.7}$$

Acting with (4.5), we see that around a purely bosonic background, (4.7) is preserved if $(1+\Gamma)\delta\theta = 0$, i.e., combined κ and ϵ transformations for which

$$2(1+\Gamma)\kappa + (1+\Gamma)\epsilon = 0 \tag{4.8}$$

which implies that $\delta\theta = (1-\Gamma)\epsilon/2$. Thus a bosonic vacuum has residual supersymmetries corresponding to solutions of [44, 45]

$$\tilde{D}_M\epsilon = 0, \qquad \Gamma\epsilon(x) = \epsilon(x) \tag{4.9}$$

We shall make use of this in seeking the membrane at the end of the universe in Section 5.4.

4.2 The M5-brane

The bosonic $M5$ worldvolume equations of motion follow from Appendix D. We work with equations of motion rather than an action because of the appearance of a self-dual worldvolume 3-form field strength h_{abc}.

The suitable pullbacks of the spacetime 3-form potential, and the induced metric are

$$A_{ijk} = \partial_i x^M \partial_j x^N \partial_k x^P A_{PNM}$$

$$\gamma_{ij} = \partial_i x^M E_M{}^A \partial_j x^N E_N{}^B \eta_{AB} \tag{4.10}$$

ξ^i $(i = 0, \ldots, 5)$ are the worldvolume coordinates, γ^{ij} is the worldvolume metric and $x^M(\xi)$ are the spacetime coordinates $(M = 0, 1, \ldots, 10)$. We introduce the worldvolume 2-form A_{ij} and corresponding worldvolume 3-form:

$$\mathcal{F}_{ijk} \equiv 3\partial_{[i} A_{jk]} - A_{ijk}. \tag{4.11}$$

The field equation for A_{ij} is

$$G^{mn}\nabla_m \mathcal{F}_{npq} \;=\; Q^{-1}\left[4Y - 2(mY + Ym) + mYm\right]_{pq} \;, \tag{4.12}$$

and the field equations for the x^M are

$$G^{mn}\nabla_m \mathcal{E}_n{}^C \;=\; \frac{Q}{\sqrt{-g}}\epsilon^{m_1\cdots m_6}\left(\tfrac{1}{6!}F^A{}_{m_1\cdots m_6} + \tfrac{1}{(3!)^2}F^A{}_{m_1m_2m_3}\,\mathcal{F}_{m_4m_5m_6}\right)P_A{}^C \;. \tag{4.13}$$

Several definitions are in order. To begin with,

$$m_a{}^b \equiv \delta_a{}^b - 2k_a{}^b \;, \qquad k_a{}^b \equiv h_{acd}h^{bcd} \;, \qquad Q \equiv (1 - \tfrac{2}{3}\mathrm{tr}\, k^2) \;,$$

$$Y_{ab} \equiv \left[4 * F - 2(m * F + *Fm) + m * Fm\right]_{ab} \;,$$

$$P_A{}^C \equiv \delta_A{}^C - \mathcal{E}_A{}^m \mathcal{E}_m{}^C \;, \qquad *F^{ab} \;:=\; \tfrac{1}{4!\sqrt{-g}}\epsilon^{abcdef}F_{cdef} \;, \tag{4.14}$$

The fields $\mathcal{F}_3$, F_4 and its Hodge dual F_7 are given by

$$\mathcal{F}_3 \;=\; dA_2 - A_3 \;, \qquad F_4 \;=\; dA_3 \;, \qquad F_7 \;=\; dA_6 + \tfrac{1}{2}\,A_3 \wedge F_4 \;. \tag{4.15}$$

The target space indices on F_4 and F_7 have been converted to worldvolume indices with factors of $\mathcal{E}_m{}^A$ defined as

$$\mathcal{E}_m{}^A(x) \equiv \partial_m x^M E_M{}^A \tag{4.16}$$

The metric

$$\gamma_{mn}(x) \equiv \mathcal{E}_m{}^A \mathcal{E}_n{}^B \eta_{AB} \;=\; e_m{}^a e_n{}^b \eta_{ab} \tag{4.17}$$

is the standard induced metric with determinant γ, and G^{mn} is another metric defined as

$$G^{mn} \equiv (m^2)^{ab} e_a{}^m e_b{}^n \;. \tag{4.18}$$

Let us note that the connection in the covariant derivative ∇_m occurring in (4.13) is the Levi-Civita connection for the induced metric γ_{mn}.

A key relation between h_{abc} and $\mathcal{F}_{abc}$ follows from the Bianchi identity $d\mathcal{F}_3 = -F_4$,and is given by

$$h_{abc} \;=\; \tfrac{1}{4}\, m_a{}^d \mathcal{F}_{bcd} \ . \tag{4.19}$$

We conclude this Section by elucidating the consequences of the central equation (4.19). To this end, we first note the useful identities

$$\begin{aligned} h_{abe}h^{cde} &= \delta^{[c}_{[a}k_{b]}{}^{d]} \\ k_{ac}k_b{}^c &= \tfrac{1}{6}\eta_{ab}\mathrm{tr}\ k^2 \\ k_a{}^d h_{bcd} &= k_{[a}{}^d h_{bc]d} \end{aligned} \tag{4.20}$$

which are consequences of the linear self-duality of h_{abc}. Taking the Hodge dual of (4.19) one finds $*\mathcal{F}_{abc} = -\mathcal{F}_{abc} + 2Q^{-1}m_a{}^d\mathcal{F}_{bcd}$. Using the identity $m^2 = 2m - Q$, we readily find the nonlinear self-duality equation

$$*\,\mathcal{F}_{mnp} = Q^{-1}G_m{}^q\mathcal{F}_{npq} \tag{4.21}$$

This equation can be expressed solely in terms of $\mathcal{F}_3$. To do this, we first insert (4.19) into (4.20), which yields the identities

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_{abe}\mathcal{F}^{cde} &= 2\delta^{[c}_{[a}X_{b]}{}^{d]} + \tfrac{1}{2}K^{-2}X_{[a}{}^c X_{b]}{}^d + 2(K^2-1)\delta^c_{[a}\delta^d_{b]} \\ X_{ac}X_b{}^c &= 4K^2(K^2-1)\eta_{ab} \\ X_a{}^d\mathcal{F}_{bcd} &= X_{[a}{}^d\mathcal{F}_{bc]d} \end{aligned} \tag{4.22}$$

where we have defined

$$\begin{aligned} K &\equiv \sqrt{1 + \tfrac{1}{24}\mathcal{F}^{abc}\mathcal{F}_{abc}} \\ X_{ab} &\equiv \tfrac{1}{2}K * \mathcal{F}_a{}^{cd}\mathcal{F}_{bcd} \ . \end{aligned} \tag{4.23}$$

Next we derive the identities

$$Q(K+1) \equiv 2$$

$$X_{ab} \equiv \tfrac{1}{2}\mathcal{F}_{acd}\mathcal{F}_b{}^{cd} - \tfrac{1}{12}\eta_{ab}\mathcal{F}_{cde}\mathcal{F}^{cde} \;=\; 4K(1+K)k_{ab} \tag{4.24}$$

We can now express (4.21) entirely in terms of $\mathcal{F}_3$ by deriving the identity

$$Q^{-1}G_{mn} = K\eta_{mn} - \tfrac{1}{2}K^{-1}X_{mn} \tag{4.25}$$

Another way of writing (4.21) is

$$\mathcal{F}^-_{abc} = \tfrac{1}{2}(1+K)^{-2}\mathcal{F}^+_{ade}\mathcal{F}^{+def}\mathcal{F}^+_{fbc} \ , \tag{4.26}$$

where K is a root of the quartic equation

$$(K+1)^3(K-1) = \tfrac{1}{24}\mathcal{F}^{+abc}\mathcal{F}^+_{ade}\mathcal{F}^{+def}\mathcal{F}^+_{fbc} \ . \tag{4.27}$$

4.3 The D3-brane

From Appendix E, the bosonic sector of the $D3$-brane coupled the background of Type IIB supergravity is given by the action

$$S_4 = -T_4 \int d^4\xi\, e^{-\phi} \sqrt{-\det(\gamma_{ij} + \mathcal{F}_{ij})} + T_4 \left[\int A_4 + \int A_2 \wedge \mathcal{F} + \frac{1}{2!} \int A_0 \wedge \mathcal{F} \wedge \mathcal{F} \right] \quad (4.28)$$

where $\mathcal{F}_{ij}$ are the components of a modified 2-form field strength

$$\mathcal{F} = F - B \ , \quad (4.29)$$

where $F = dV$ is the usual field strength 2-form of the Born-Infeld field V and B is the pullback to the worldvolume of the NS-NS Type IIB 2-form potential B, and where A_0, A_2 and A_4 are the R-R forms. We use the same letter for superspace forms and their pullbacks to the worldvolume.

4.4 Problems 4

1. Show that the equations for the bosonic sector of the Type IIA superstring in $D = 10$ follow from those of the supermembrane in $D = 11$ by assuming an $M_{10} \times S^1$ topology, wrapping the membrane around the S^1 and taking the small radius limit [44].

5 ADS/CFT : THE MEMBRANE AT THE END OF THE UNIVERSE

5.1 Singletons live on the boundary

As emphasized by Fronsdal et al. [30, 31], singletons are best thought of as living not in the $(d+1)$-dimensional bulk of the AdS_{d+1} spacetime but rather on the d-dimensional $S^1 \times S^{d-1}$ boundary where the AdS group $SO(d-1,2)$ plays the role of the *conformal* group. Remaining for the moment with our 4-dimensional example, consider a scalar field $\Phi(t, r, \theta, \phi)$ on AdS_4 with metric (2.33), described by the action

$$S_{bulk} = \int_{AdS_4} d^4x \sqrt{-g} \frac{1}{2} \Phi \left[g^{\mu\nu} \nabla_\mu \nabla_\nu - M^2 \right] \Phi \quad (5.1)$$

Note that this differs from the conventional Klein-Gordon action by a boundary term. Since the scalar Laplacian on AdS_4 has eigenvalues $E_0(E_0 - 3)a^2$, the critical value of M^2 for a singleton with $(E_0, s) = (1/2, 0)$ is

$$M^2 = \frac{5}{4} a^2 \quad (5.2)$$

In this case, one can show with some effort [30, 31] that as $r \to \infty$,

$$\Phi(t, r, \theta, \phi) \to r^{-1/2}\phi(t, \theta, \phi) \tag{5.3}$$

and hence that the radial dependence drops out:

$$S_{boundary} = \int_{S^1 \times S^2} d^3\xi \sqrt{-h}[-\frac{1}{2}h^{ij}\nabla_i\phi\nabla_j\phi - \frac{1}{8}a^2\phi^2] \tag{5.4}$$

Here we are integrating over a 3-manifold with $S^1 \times S^2$ topology and with metric

$$h^{ij}d\xi^i d\xi^j = -dt^2 + \frac{1}{a^2}(d\theta^2 + \sin^2\theta d\phi^2) \tag{5.5}$$

This 3-manifold is sometimes referred to as the *boundary* of AdS_4 but note that the metric h_{ij} is not obtained by taking the $r \to \infty$ limit of $g_{\mu\nu}$ but rather the $r \to \infty$ limit of the conformally rescaled metric $\Omega^2 g_{\mu\nu}$ where $\Omega = 1/ar$. The radius of the S^2 is a^{-1}, not infinity. Most particle physicists are familiar with the conformal group in flat Minkowski space. It is the group of coordinate transformations which leave invariant the Minkowski lightcone. In the case of three-dimensional Minkowski space, M_3, it is $SO(3,2)$. In the present context, however, the spacetime is curved with topology $S^1 \times S^2$, but still admits $SO(3,2)$ as its conformal group[8], i.e. as the group which leaves invariant the three-dimensional lightcone $h_{ij}d\xi^i d\xi^j = 0$. The failure to discriminate between these different kinds of conformal invariance is, we believe, a source of confusion in the singleton literature. In particular, the ϕ^2 "mass" term appearing in the action (5.4) would be incompatible with conformal invariance if the action were on M_3 but is essential for conformal invariance on $S^1 \times S^2$. Moreover, the coefficient $-a^2/8$ is uniquely fixed [39]. In Section 5.4 we shall derive the singleton action (5.4) including the scalar mass terms, starting from the membrane action (4.1).

So although singleton actions of the form (5.1) and their superpartners appeared in the Kaluza-Klein harmonic expansions on $AdS_4 \times S^7$ [34, 35, 36], they could be gauged away everywhere except on the boundary where the above $OSp(4|8)$ corresponds to the superconformal group [37]. One finds an $(n = 8, d = 3)$ supermultiplet with 8 scalars ϕ^A and 8 spinors $\chi^{\dot{A}}$, where the indices A and $\dot{A}$ range over 1 to 8 and denote the 8_s and 8_c representations of $SO(8)$, respectively. The $OSp(4|8)$ action is a generalization of (5.4) and is given by [39]

$$S_{singleton} = \int_{S^1 \times S^2} d^3\xi \sqrt{-h}[-\frac{1}{2}h^{ij}\nabla_i\phi^A\nabla_j\phi^A - \frac{1}{8}a^2\phi^A\phi^A + \frac{i}{2}\bar{\chi}^{\dot{A}}(1-\gamma)\gamma^i D_i\chi^{\dot{A}}] \tag{5.6}$$

[8]One sometimes finds the statement in the physics literature that the only compact spaces admitting conformal Killing vectors are those isomorphic to spheres. By a theorem of Yano and Nagano [71], this is true for *Einstein spaces*, but $S^1 \times S^2$ is not Einstein.

where $\gamma = -\gamma_0\gamma_1\gamma_2$ and where D_i is the covariant derivative appropriate to the $S^1 \times S^2$ background.

In the case of $AdS_5 \times S^5$ one finds a $(n = 4, d = 4)$ supermultiplet with 1 vector A_i, $(i = 0, 1, 2, 3)$, a complex spinor $\lambda^a{}_+$, $(a = 1, 2, 3, 4)$, obeying $\gamma_5\lambda^a{}_+ = \lambda^a{}_+$ and 6 real scalars ϕ^{ab}, obeying $\phi^{ab} = -\phi^{ab}$, $\phi^{ab} = \epsilon^{abcd}\phi_{cd}/2$. The corresponding action for the doubletons of $SU(2, 2|4)$ is [40]

$$S_{doubleton} = \int_{S^1\times S^3}[-\frac{1}{4}F_{ij}F^{ij} - \frac{1}{4}a^2\phi_{ab}\phi^{ab} - \frac{1}{4}\partial_i\phi_{ab}\partial^i\phi^{ab} + i\bar{\lambda}_{+a}\gamma^i D_i\lambda^a{}_+] \tag{5.7}$$

where $F_{ij} = 2\partial_{[i}A_{j]}$. However, in contrast to the singletons, we know of no derivation of this doubleton action on the boundary starting from an action in the bulk analogous to (5.4).

In the case of $AdS_7 \times S^4$ one finds a $((n_+, n_-) = (2, 0), d = 6)$ supermultiplet with a 2-form B_{ij}, $(i = 0, 1, \ldots 5)$, whose field strength is self-dual, 8 spinors $\lambda^A{}_+$, $(A = 1, 2, 3, 4)$, obeying $\gamma^7\lambda^A{}_+ = \lambda^A{}_+$ and 5 scalars ϕ^a, $(a = 1, 2, \ldots 5)$. The $OSp(6, 2|4)$ tripleton covariant field equations on $S^1 \times S^5$ are [40]:

$$(\nabla^i\nabla_i - 4a^2)\phi^a = 0$$

$$\gamma^i D_i\lambda^A{}_+ = 0$$

$$H^{ijk} = \frac{1}{3!}\sqrt{-h}\epsilon^{ijklmn}H_{lmn} \tag{5.8}$$

where $H_{ijk} = 3\partial_{[i}B_{jk]}$. Once again, we know of no derivation of these tripleton field equations on the boundary starting from equations in the bulk.

5.2 The membrane as a singleton: the membrane/supergravity bootstrap

Being defined over the boundary of AdS_4, the $OSp(4|8)$ singleton action (5.6) is a *three dimensional* theory with signature $(-, +, +)$ describing 8 scalars and 8 spinors. With the discovery of the eleven-dimensional supermembrane [41, 42], it was noted that 8 scalars and 8 spinors on a three-dimensional worldvolume with signature $(-, +, +)$ is just what is obtained after gauge-fixing the supermembrane action! Moreover, kappa-symmetry of this supermembrane action forces the background fields to obey the field equations of $(N = 1, D = 11)$ supergravity. It was therefore suggested [38] that on the $AdS_4 \times S^7$ supergravity background, the supermembrane whose worldvolume occupies the $S^1 \times S^2$ boundary of the AdS_4 could be regarded as the singleton of $OSp(4|8)$. Noting that these singletons also appear in the Kaluza-Klein harmonic expansion of this supergravity background, this further suggested a form of bootstrap [38] in which the supergravity gives rise

to the membrane on the boundary which in turn yields the supergravity in the bulk. This conjecture received further support with the subsequent discovery of the "membrane at the end of the universe" [38, 44, 39, 45, 46] to be discussed in Section 5.4, and the realisation [51] that the eleven-dimensional supermembrane emerges as a solution of the $D = 11$ supergravity field equations.

The possibility of a similar 3-brane/supergravity bootstrap arising for the $SU(2,2|4)$ doubletons on $AdS_5 \times S^5$ and a similar 5-brane/supergravity bootstrap arising for the $OSp(6,2|4)$ tripletons on $AdS_7 \times S^4$ was also considered [38]. Ironically, however, it was (erroneously as we now know) rejected since the only supermembranes that were known at the time [52] had worldvolume theories described by *scalar* supermultiplets, whereas the doubletons and tripletons required vector and tensor supermultiplets, respectively. See Section 5.3.

Nevertheless, since everything seemed to fit nicely for the $(d = 3, D = 11)$ slot on the brane-scan of supersymmetric extended objects with worldvolume dimension d, there followed a good deal of activity relating other super p-branes in other dimensions to singletons and superconformal field theories [44, 45, 39, 47, 48, 43, 49, 40, 50]. In particular, it was pointed out [39, 40, 48] that there was a one-to one-correspondence between the 12 points on the brane-scan as it was then known [52] and the 12 superconformal groups in Nahm's classification [37] admitting singleton representations, as shown in Table 5. To understand these 12 points on the brane-scan, we recall the matching of physical bose and fermi degrees of freedom on the worldvolume. As the p-brane moves through spacetime, its trajectory is described by the functions $X^M(\xi)$ where X^M are the spacetime coordinates $(M = 0, 1, \ldots, D-1)$ and ξ^i are the worldvolume coordinates $(i = 0, 1, \ldots, d-1)$. It is often convenient to make the so-called *static gauge choice* by making the $D = d + (D-d)$ split

$$X^M(\xi) = (X^\mu(\xi), Y^m(\xi)), \tag{5.9}$$

where $\mu = 0, 1, \ldots, d-1$ and $m = d, \ldots, D-1$, and then setting

$$X^\mu(\xi) = \xi^\mu. \tag{5.10}$$

Thus the only physical worldvolume degrees of freedom are given by the $(D-d)$ $Y^m(\xi)$. So the number of on-shell bosonic degrees of freedom is

$$N_B = D - d. \tag{5.11}$$

To describe the super p-brane we augment the D bosonic coordinates $X^M(\xi)$ with anticommuting fermionic coordinates $\theta^\alpha(\xi)$. Depending on D, this spinor could be Dirac, Weyl,

Majorana or Majorana-Weyl. The fermionic kappa symmetry means that half of the spinor degrees of freedom are redundant and may be eliminated by a physical gauge choice. The net result is that the theory exhibits a *d-dimensional worldvolume supersymmetry* where the number of fermionic generators is exactly half of the generators in the original spacetime supersymmetry. This partial breaking of supersymmetry is a key idea. Let M be the number of real components of the minimal spinor and N the number of supersymmetries in D spacetime dimensions and let m and n be the corresponding quantities in d worldvolume dimensions. Let us first consider $d > 2$. Since kappa symmetry always halves the number of fermionic degrees of freedom and going on-shell halves it again, the number of on-shell fermionic degrees of freedom is

$$N_F = \frac{1}{2}mn = \frac{1}{4}MN. \tag{5.12}$$

Worldvolume supersymmetry demands $N_B = N_F$ and hence

$$D - d = \frac{1}{2}mn = \frac{1}{4}MN. \tag{5.13}$$

A list of dimensions, number of real dimensions of the minimal spinor and possible supersymmetries is given in Table 2, from which we see that there are only 8 solutions of (5.13) all with $N = 1$, which exactly match the singletons shown in Table 5. We note in particular that $D_{\max} = 11$ since $M \geq 64$ for $D \geq 12$ and hence (5.13) cannot be satisfied. Similarly $d_{\max} = 6$ since $m \geq 16$ for $d \geq 7$. The case $d = 2$ is special because of the ability to treat left and right moving modes independently. If we require the sum of both left and right moving bosons and fermions to be equal, then we again find the condition (5.13). This provides a further 4 solutions all with $N = 2$, corresponding to Type II superstrings in $D = 3, 4, 6$ and 10 (or 8 solutions in all if we treat Type IIA and Type IIB separately). Both the gauge-fixed Type IIA and Type IIB superstrings will display $(8, 8)$ supersymmetry on the worldsheet. If we require only left (or right) matching, then (5.13) is replaced by

$$D - 2 = n = \frac{1}{2}MN, \tag{5.14}$$

which allows another 4 solutions in $D = 3, 4, 6$ and 10, all with $N = 1$. The gauge-fixed theory will display $(8, 0)$ worldsheet supersymmetry. The heterotic string falls into this category.

The number of dimensions transverse to the brane, $D - d$, equals the number of scalars in the singleton supermultiplet. (The two factors appearing in the $d = 2$ case is simply a reflection of the ability of strings to have right and left movers. For brevity, we have written

D↑								
11	.			$\mathbf{OSp(4\|8)}$				
10	.		$[OSp(2\|8)]^2$				$OSp(6,2\|2)$	
9	.					$F(4)$		
8	.				$SU(2,2\|2)$			
7	.			$OSp(4\|4)$				
6	.		$[OSp(2\|4)]^2$		$SU(2,2\|1)$			
5	.			$OSp(4\|2)$				
4	.		$[OSp(2\|2)]^2$	$OSp(4\|1)$				
3	.		$[OSp(2\|1)]^2$					
2	.							
1	.							
0	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	d→

Table 5: The brane scan of superconformal groups admitting singletons.

the Type II assignments in Table 5, but more generally we could have $OSp(2|p) \times OSp(2|q)$ where p and q are the number of left and right supersymmetries [53].) Note that the $d = 6$ upper limit on the worldvolume dimension is consistent with the requirement of renormalizability [47]. Note, however, that the $(d = 3, D = 11)$, $OSp(4|8)$ slot (written in boldface) occupies a privileged position in that the corresponding $D = 11$ supergravity theory admits the $AdS_4 \times S^7$ solution with $OSp(4|8)$ symmetry, whereas the other supergravities do not admit solutions with the superconformal group as a symmetry. For example, $D = 10$ supergravity admits an $AdS_3 \times S^7$ solution [54, 65], but it does not have the full $[OSp(2|8)]^2$ symmetry because the dilaton is non-trivial and acts as a conformal Killing vector on the AdS_3. This is slightly mysterious, since the bulk theory has less symmetry than the boundary theory. We shall return to this in Sections 5.5 and 5.7.

5.3 Doubletons and tripletons revisited

These early works focussed on scalar supermultiplets because these were the only p-branes known in 1988 [52]. However, with the discovery in 1990 of Type II p-brane solitons [59, 60, 57, 58, 61], vector and tensor multiplets were also seen to play a role. In particular,

D↑								
11	.							
10	.				$\mathbf{SU(2,2\|4)}$			
9	.							
8	.				$SU(2,2\|2)$			
7	.							
6	.							
5	.							
4	.				$SU(2,2\|1)$			
3	.							
2	.							
1	.							
0	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	d→

Table 6: The brane scan of superconformal groups admitting doubletons

the worldvolume fields of the self-dual Type IIB superthreebrane were shown to be described by an $(n = 4, d = 4)$ gauge theory [58], which on the boundary of AdS_5 is just the doubleton supermultiplet of the superconformal group $SU(2,2|4)$! Thus one can after all entertain a 3-brane-doubleton-supergravity bootstrap similar to the membrane-singleton-supergravity bootstrap of Section 5.2, and we may now draw the doubleton brane scan of Table 6. Once again, the restriction to $d = 4$ is consistent with renormalizability. Note, however, that the $(d = 4, D = 10)$, $SU(2,2|4)$ slot (written in boldface) occupies a privileged position in that the corresponding $D = 10$ Type IIB supergravity admits the $AdS_5 \times S^5$ solution with $SU(2,2|4)$ symmetry, whereas the other supergravities do not admit solutions with the superconformal group as a symmetry since, as discussed in Section 5.5, the dilaton is again non-trivial.

Similarly, with the discovery of the M-theory fivebrane [62], it was realized [64] that the zero modes are described by an $((n_+, n_-) = (2,0), d = 6)$ multiplet with a chiral 2-form, 8 spinors and 5 scalars, which on the boundary of AdS_7 is just the tripleton supermultiplet of the superconformal group $OSp(6,2|4)$! (These zero modes are the same as those of the Type IIA fivebrane, found previously in [59, 60]). Thus one can after all also entertain

D↑								
11	.						**OSp(6, 2|4)**	
10	.							
9	.							
8	.							
7	.						$OSp(6,2\|2)$	
6	.							
5	.							
4	.							
3	.							
2	.							
1	.							
0	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	d→

Table 7: The brane scan of superconformal groups admitting tripletons

a 5-brane-tripleton-supergravity bootstrap similar to the membrane-singleton-supergravity bootstrap of Section 5.2. Thus we may now draw the tripleton brane scan of Table 7. Note once again, however, that the $(d = 6, D = 11)$, $OSp(6, 2|4)$ slot (written in boldface) occupies a privileged position in that the corresponding $D = 11$ supergravity admits the $AdS_7 \times S^4$ solution with $OSp(6, 2|4)$ symmetry, whereas the other supergravities do not admit solutions with the superconformal group as a symmetry since, as discussed in Section 5.5, the dilaton is again non-trivial.

With the inclusion of branes with vector and tensor supermultiplets on their worldvolume, another curiosity arises. Whereas the singleton brane scan of Table 5 exhausts all the scalar branes and the tripleton brane scan of Table 7 exhausts all the tensor branes, the doubleton brane scan of Table 6 is only a subset of all the vector branes [55]. The Type IIB 3-brane is special because gauge theories are conformal only in $d = 4$.

5.4 The membrane at the end of the universe

As further evidence of the membrane/supergravity bootstrap idea, solutions of the $D = 11$ supermembrane equations (4.2) and (4.3) were sought for which the spacetime is $AdS_4 \times M^7$

and for which the supermembrane occupies the $S^1 \times S^2$ boundary of the AdS_4. As we shall now recall, the BPS condition was achieved only as $r \to \infty$, hence the name *the Membrane at the End of the Universe* [44, 45, 78, 46].

We substitute (2.19) and (2.5) into (4.2) and (4.3) and look for solutions of the form

$$t = \xi^0, \qquad \theta = \xi^1, \qquad \phi = \xi^2 \tag{5.15}$$

so that the membrane is embedded in the AdS_4 as

$$ds_4^2 = -\cosh^2\rho(d\xi^0)^2 + \frac{1}{a^2}d\rho^2 + \frac{1}{a^2}\sinh^2\rho((d\xi^1)^2 + \sin^2\xi^1(d\xi^2)^2) \tag{5.16}$$

In order to show that this configuration does indeed satisfy the requirements of unbroken supersymmetry (4.9), we first exhibit a spinor ϵ satisfying $\tilde{D}_M\epsilon = 0$ everywhere and then show how it satisfies $\Gamma\epsilon = \epsilon$ as $r \to \infty$. It is not difficult to show that

$$\Gamma = \gamma \otimes I \tag{5.17}$$

where $\gamma \equiv \gamma_{012}$. First we look for spinors of the form (2.39), then the general solution for $\epsilon(x)$ is

$$\epsilon = \sqrt{2}(\sinh\rho/2 + \gamma\cosh\rho/2)\zeta(t,\theta,\phi) \tag{5.18}$$

where ζ satisfies

$$(1+\gamma)(\nabla_i + \frac{1}{2}a\gamma_i\gamma_3)\zeta = 0 \tag{5.19}$$

where ∇_i is the covariant derivative on the $S^1 \times S^2$ boundary of AdS_4 with metric (5.5). One can show [44] that this equation has four solutions, implying the well-known result that AdS_4 has four Killing spinors.

Since $r = \infty$ corresponds to $\rho = \infty$, it follows from (5.18), (5.17) that ϵ becomes an eigenstate of γ and hence $\Gamma\epsilon = \epsilon$ "at the end of the universe". Thus we have shown that the membrane at the end of the universe is supersymmetric whenever M_7 admits Killing spinors. As we have seen in Section 2.2, the number N of such spinors depends on the Weyl holonomy of M_7 and lies between 0 and 8. It remains to show that the action for such a membrane is indeed the $OSp(4|N)$ singleton action (5.6). To simplify matters we shall now demonstrate this for the bosonic radial mode $r(\xi)$. Substituting the $AdS_4 \times M_7$ solution and the brane ansatz (5.15) into the membrane action (4.1) we find

$$S = T_3\int_{S^1\times S^2} d^3\xi\left[-\sqrt{-det(g_{ij} + a^{-2}\partial_i\rho\partial_j\rho)} + \sinh^3\rho\right] \tag{5.20}$$

where from (4.3) and (2.19)

$$g_{ij} = \begin{pmatrix} -\cosh^2\rho & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{a^2}\sinh^2\rho & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{a^2}\sinh^2\rho\sin^2\theta \end{pmatrix} \tag{5.21}$$

Hence

$$S = T_3 \int_{S^1\times S^2} d^3\xi\sqrt{-h}\left[-\frac{1}{2a^2}\cosh\rho\; h^{ij}\partial_i\rho\partial_j\rho - \cosh\rho\sinh^2\rho + \sinh^3\rho\right] \tag{5.22}$$

Since we are interested in the $r\to\infty$ limit, we consider only large ρ, for which

$$S = \frac{T_3}{8}\int_{S^1\times S^2} d^3\xi\sqrt{-h}\left[-\frac{2}{a^2}e^\rho h^{ij}\partial_i\rho\partial_j\rho - 2e^\rho\right] \tag{5.23}$$

So, bearing in mind that $T_3\sim a^3$ and making the change of variable

$$e^\rho \sim \frac{1}{a}\phi^2 \tag{5.24}$$

we find

$$S = \int_{S^1\times S^2} d^3\xi\sqrt{-h}\left[-\frac{1}{2}h^{ij}\nabla_i\phi\nabla_j\phi - \frac{1}{8}a^2\phi^2\right] \tag{5.25}$$

which is just the singleton action (5.4), including the scalar mass terms necessary for conformal invariance on $S^1\times S^2$.

Following [141], this result may be generalized to arbitrary $(d-1)$-branes occupying the conformal boundary M of an arbitrary Einstein $(d+1)$-dimensional manifold W. We shall adapt the notation and the signature used in [141] for our convenience. The boundary M has a natural conformal structure but not a natural metric. Let h_{ij} be an arbitrary metric on the boundary in its conformal class. Here the ξ^i, $i=0,\ldots,d-1$ are an arbitrary set of local coordinates on the boundary. There is then a unique way [199] to extend the ξ^i to coordinates on W near the boundary, adding an additional coordinate ρ that tends to infinity on the boundary, such that the metric in a neighborhood of the boundary is

$$ds^2 = \frac{1}{a^2}\left(d\rho^2 + \frac{1}{4}e^{2\rho}h_{ij}d\xi^i d\xi^j - P_{ij}d\xi^i d\xi^j + O(e^{-2\rho})\right) \tag{5.26}$$

where

$$P_{ij} = \frac{2(D-1)R_{ij} - g_{ij}R}{2(D-1)(D-2)}, \tag{5.27}$$

and R_{ij} is the Ricci tensor of M, which implies

$$g^{ij}P_{ij} = \frac{R}{2(d-1)}. \tag{5.28}$$

We find

$$S = \frac{T_d}{2^d}\int_M d^d\xi\sqrt{-h}\left[-\frac{2}{a^2}e^\rho h^{ij}\partial_i\rho\partial_j\rho - \frac{2}{(d-1)(d-2)}e^\rho R\right] \tag{5.29}$$

we recognise the curvature term as that required for Weyl invariance of the action [39].

5.5 Near horizon geometry and p-brane aristocracy

More recently, AdS has emerged as the near-horizon geometry of black p-brane solutions [64, 65, 66, 7] in D dimensions. The dual brane, with worldvolume dimension $\tilde{d} = D-d-2$, interpolates between D-dimensional Minkowski space M_D and $AdS_{\tilde{d}+1} \times S^{d+1}$ (or $M_{\tilde{d}+1} \times S^3$ if $d = 2$). To see this, we recall that such branes arise generically as solitons of the following action [72]:

$$I = \frac{1}{2\kappa_D{}^2} \int d^D x \sqrt{-g} \left[R - \frac{1}{2}(\partial\phi)^2 - \frac{1}{2(d+1)!} e^{-\alpha\phi} F_{d+1}{}^2 \right] \tag{5.30}$$

where F_{d+1} is the field strength of a d-form potential A_d and α is the constant

$$\alpha^2 = 4 - \frac{2d\tilde{d}}{d+\tilde{d}} \tag{5.31}$$

Written in terms of the $(d-1)$-brane sigma-model metric $e^{-\alpha/d\phi} g_{MN}$, the solutions are [72, 7]

$$\begin{aligned} ds^2 &= H^{\frac{2-d}{d}} dx^\mu dx_\mu + H^{2/d}(dy^2 + y^2 d\Omega_{d+1}{}^2) \\ e^{2\phi} &= H^\alpha \\ F_{d+1} &= dL^d \epsilon_{d+1} \end{aligned} \tag{5.32}$$

where

$$H = 1 + \frac{L^d}{y^d} \tag{5.33}$$

For a stack of N singly charged branes $L^d = Nb^d$ and the near horizon, or large N, geometry corresponds to

$$ds^2 \sim \frac{y}{L}{}^{2-d} dx^\mu dx_\mu + \frac{L^2}{y^2} dy^2 + L^2 d\Omega_{d+1}^2 \tag{5.34}$$

Or, defining the new coordinate

$$y = Le^{\zeta/L} \tag{5.35}$$

we get

$$\begin{aligned} ds^2 &\sim e^{\frac{2-d}{L}\zeta} dx^\mu dx_\mu + d\zeta^2 + L^2 d\Omega_{d+1}{}^2 \\ \phi &\sim \frac{d\alpha}{2L}\zeta \\ F_{d+1} &\sim dL^d \epsilon_{d+1} \end{aligned} \tag{5.36}$$

Thus for $d \neq 2$ the near-horizon geometry is $AdS_{\tilde{d}+1} \times S^{d+1}$. Note, however, that the gradient of the dilaton is generically non-zero and plays the role of a conformal Killing vector on $AdS_{\tilde{d}+1}$. Consequently, there is no enhancement of symmetry in the near-horizon

limit. The unbroken supersymmetry remains one-half and the bosonic symmetry remains $P_{\tilde{d}} \times SO(d+2)$. (If $d = 2$, then (5.36) reduces to

$$ds^2 \sim dx^\mu dx_\mu + d\zeta^2 + L^2 d\Omega_3{}^2$$

$$\phi \sim \frac{\alpha}{L}\zeta$$

$$F_3 \sim 2L^2\epsilon_3 \tag{5.37}$$

which is $M_{\tilde{d}+1} \times S^3$, with a linear dilaton vacuum. The bosonic symmetry remains $P_{\tilde{d}} \times SO(4)$.)

Of particular interest are the ($\alpha = 0$) subset of solitons for which the dilaton is zero or constant: the *non-dilatonic p-branes*. From (5.31) we see that for branes with one kind of charge there are only 3 cases:

$$D = 11 : d = 6, \tilde{d} = 3$$

$$D = 10 : d = 4, \tilde{d} = 4$$

$$D = 11 : d = 3, \tilde{d} = 6$$

which are precisely the three cases that occupied privileged positions on the singleton, doubleton and tripleton brane-scans of Tables 5, 6 and 7. Then the near-horizon geometry coincides with the $AdS_{\tilde{d}+1} \times S^{d+1}$ non-dilatonic maximally symmetric compactifications of the corresponding supergravities. The supersymmetry doubles and the bosonic symmetry is also enhanced to $SO(\tilde{d}, 2) \times SO(d+2)$. Thus the total symmetry is given by the conformal supergroups $OSp(4|8)$, $SU(2,2|4)$ and $OSp(6,2|4)$, respectively.

For bound states of branes with M kinds of charge, the constant α gets replaced by [76, 73, 74]

$$\alpha^2 = \frac{4}{M} - \frac{2d\tilde{d}}{d+\tilde{d}} \tag{5.38}$$

A non-dilatonic solution (α=0) occurs for $M = 2$:

$$D = 6 : d = 2, \tilde{d} = 2$$

which is just the dyonic string [75], of which the self-dual string [72] is a special case, whose near-horizon geometry is $AdS_3 \times S^3$. For $M = 3$ we have

$$D = 5 : d = 2, \tilde{d} = 1$$

which is the 3-charge black hole [80], whose near-horizon geometry is $AdS_2 \times S^3$, and

$$D = 5 : d = 1, \tilde{d} = 2$$

which is the 3-charge string [80] whose near-horizon geometry is $AdS_3 \times S^2$. For $M = 4$ we have

$$D = 4 : d = 1, \tilde{d} = 1$$

which is the 4-charge black hole [81, 82], of which the Reissner-Nordström solution is a special case [76], and whose near-horizon geometry is $AdS_2 \times S^2$ [77].

Thus we see that not all branes are created equal. A *p-brane aristocracy* obtains whose members are those branes whose near-horizon geometries have as their symmetry the conformal supergroups. As an example of a plebian brane we can consider the ten-dimensional superstring:

$$D = 10 : d = 6, \tilde{d} = 2$$

whose near-horizon geometry is $AdS_3 \times S^7$ but with a non-trivial dilaton of Section 5.2 which does not have the conformal group $[OSp(2|8)]^2$ as its symmetry, even though this group appears in the $(D = 10, \tilde{d} = 2)$ slot on the singleton brane-scan of Table 5. In which case, of course, one may ask what role do these singletons play. We shall return to this in Section 5.7.

The original membrane at the end of the universe was a spherical brane embedded in the AdS_4 geometry as given in 5.4. Alternatively, one could take as the membrane at the end of the universe to be the flat near-horizon membrane, which is embedded as

$$ds^2 = e^{4\zeta/L}(-(d\xi^0)^2 + (d\xi^1)^2 + (d\xi^2)^2) + d\zeta^2 \tag{5.39}$$

and has M_3 topology. It is still possible to associate an $OSp(4|8)$ action but this time it is defined over M_3 and has no scalar mass terms [78, 79]. One can continue to call these fields "singletons", of course, if by singleton one simply means anything transforming according to the $D(1/2, 0)$ and $D(1, 1/2)$ representations of $SO(3, 2)$. A comparison of these two approaches is discussed in some detail in [78].

5.6 Supermembranes with fewer supersymmetries. Skew-whiffing.

So far we have focussed attention on compactifications to $AdS_{\tilde{d}+1}$ on round spheres S^{d+1} which have maximal supersymmetry, but the supergravity equations admit infinitely many other compactifications on Einstein spaces X^{d+1} which have fewer supersymmetries [20]. Indeed generic X^{d+1} have no supersymmetries at all[9]. We note in this connection the

[9]Thus in the early eighties, the most highly prized solutions were those with many supersymmetries. Nowadays, bragging rights seem to go those which have none!

skew-whiffing theorem [20], which states that for every $AdS_{\tilde{d}+1}$ compactification preserving supersymmetry, there exists one with no supersymmetry simply obtained by reversing the orientation of X^{d+1} (or, equivalently, reversing the sign of F_{d+1}). The only exceptions are when X^{d+1} are round spheres which preserve the maximum supersymmetry for either orientation. A corollary is that other *symmetric spaces*, which necessarily admit an orientation-reversing isometry, can have no supersymmeties. Examples are provided by products of round spheres.

The question naturally arises as to whether these compactifications with fewer supersymmetries also arise as near-horizon geometries of p-brane solitons. The answer is yes and the soliton solutions are easy to construct [67, 68]. One simply makes the replacement

$$d\Omega_{d+1}{}^2 \to d\hat{\Omega}_{d+1}{}^2 \tag{5.40}$$

in (5.32), where $d\hat{\Omega}_{d+1}{}^2$ is the metric on an arbitrary Einstein space X^{d+1} with the same scalar curvature as the round S^{d+1}. The space need only be Einstein; it need not be homogeneous [67]. (There also exist brane solutions on Ricci flat X^{d+1} [67] but we shall not discuss them here). Note, however, that these non-round-spherical solutions do not tend to $(D-d)$-dimensional Minkowski space as $r \to \infty$. Instead the metric on the $(D-\tilde{d})$-dimensional space transverse to the brane is asymptotic to a generalized cone

$$ds_{D-\tilde{d}}{}^2 = dr^2 + r^2 d\hat{\Omega}_{d+1}{}^2 \tag{5.41}$$

and $(D-d)$-dimensional translational invariance is absent except when X^{d+1} is a round sphere. The number of supersymmetries preserved by these p-branes is determined by the number of Killing spinors on X^{d+1}.

To illustrate these ideas let us focus on the eleven-dimensional supermembrane. The usual supermembrane interpolates between M_{11} and $AdS_4\times$ round S^7, has symmetry $P_3 \times SO(8)$ and preserves 1/2 of the spacetime supersymmetries for either orientation of the round S^7. Replacing the round S^7 by generic Einstein spaces X^7 leads to membranes with symmetry $P_3 \times G$, where G is the isometry group of X^7. For example $G = SO(5) \times SO(3)$ for the squashed S^7 [69, 70]. For one orientation of X^7, they preserve $N/16$ spacetime supersymmetries where $1 \leq N \leq 8$ is the number of Killing spinors on X^7; for the opposite orientation they preserve no supersymmetries since then X^7 has no Killing spinors. For example, $N = 1$ for the left-squashed S^7 owing to its G_2 holonomy [69, 20, 70], whereas $N = 0$ for the right-squashed S^7. However, all these solutions satisfy the same Bogomol'nyi bound between the mass and charge as the usual supermembrane [67]. Of course, skew-whiffing is not the only way to obtain vacua with less than maximal supersymmetry. A

summary of known X^7, their supersymmetries and stability properties is given in [20]. Note, however, that skew-whiffed vacua are automatically stable at the classical level since skew-whiffing affects only the spin 3/2, 1/2 and 0^- towers in the Kaluza-Klein spectrum, whereas the criterion for classical stability involves only the 0^+ tower [20].

5.7 The Maldacena conjecture

The year 1998 marks a revolution in anti-de Sitter space brought about by Maldacena's conjectured duality between physics in the bulk of AdS and a conformal field theory on the boundary [111]. In particular, M-theory on $AdS_4 \times S^7$ is dual to a non-abelian ($n = 8, d = 3$) superconformal theory, Type IIB string theory on $AdS_5 \times S^5$ is dual to a $d = 4$ $SU(N)$ super Yang-Mills theory theory and M-theory on $AdS_7 \times S^4$ is dual to a non-abelian ($(n_+, n_-) = (2, 0), d = 6$) conformal theory. In particular, as has been spelled out most clearly in the $d = 4$ $SU(N)$ Yang-Mills case, there is seen to be a correspondence between the Kaluza-Klein mass spectrum in the bulk and the conformal dimension of operators on the boundary [123, 125].

One immediately recognises that the dimensions and supersymmetries of these three conformal theories are exactly the same as the singleton, doubleton and tripleton supermultiplets of Section 5. Moreover, both the old and new AdS/CFT correspondences are *holographic* in the sense of [131, 132]. Following Maldacena's conjecture [111], therefore, a number of papers appeared reviving the old singleton-AdS-membrane- superconformal field theory connections [119, 120, 121, 78, 118, 122, 123, 124, 125, 156, 84, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130] and applying them to this new duality context. What are the differences?

The first difference is that the branes were spherical as opposed to flat, since the "boundary" in question for the singletons and p-branes at the end of the universe was the $S^1 \times S^p$ with finite radius $1/a$ for the S^p. As such, superconformal invariance requires mass terms for the scalars, as discussed in Section 5.1. The branes in the Maldacena conjecture, on the other hand, are the flat Minkowski space branes embedded in AdS in the way dictated by the near-horizon geometry.

Another curious difference is that, with the exception of the three aristocratic branes, all the slots on the three brane-scans of superconformal field theories corresponded to bulk supergravities whose brane solutions are dilatonic, and hence have a symmetry smaller than the boundary theory. It seems that the branes at the end of the universe do not care about the dilaton because the ρ =constant surfaces in (5.16) (or the ζ = constant surfaces in (5.39)) posess the full superconformal symmetry even though the bulk AdS solution does

not. In other words, they admit the maximal set of conformal Killing vectors even though the bulk admits less than the maximal set of Killing vectors. This contrasts with the new AdS/CFT conjecture where a non-conformal supergravity solution in the bulk [65] is deemed to be dual to non-conformal field theory on the boundary [118]. It is not obvious at the moment whether this difference is real or apparent and it would be interesting to pursue the matter further.

Thirdly, although the *membrane/supergravity bootstrap* idea, that physics in the bulk of AdS should be dictated by the membrane on the boundary and vice-versa, might nowadays be called "holographic", it was not motivated by considerations of entropy. Rather, in analogy with string theory where there are self-consistency requirements between the spacetime and worldsheet dynamics, it was expected that a similar phenomenon should hold for membranes and the membrane on the boundary of AdS was simply a special case.

Fourthly, attention was focussed on *free* superconformal theories on the boundary as opposed to the *interacting* theories currently under consideration. For example, although the worldvolume fields of the Type IIB 3-brane were known to be described by an $(n = 4, d = 4)$ gauge theory [58], we now know that this brane admits the interpretation of a Dirichlet brane [112] and that the superposition of N such branes yields a *non-abelian* $SU(N)$ gauge theory [113]. These observations are crucial to the new duality conjecture [111]. For earlier related work on coincident threebranes and $n = 4$ super Yang Mills, see [114, 115, 116, 117].

Let us consider the solution for N coincident 3-branes corresponding to N units of 5-form flux [57, 58]. As we have already seen in section 3.2, $L = N^{1/4}b$ and the near horizon limit may equally well be regarded as the large N limit. We find $AdS_5 \times S^5$, but with an AdS radius proportional to $N^{1/4}$. The philosophy is that Type IIB supergravity is a good approximation for large N and that Type IIB stringy excitations correspond to operators whose dimensions diverge for $N \to \infty$. This makes contact with the whole industry of large N QCD. These large N, non-abelian features were absent in the considerations of a 3-brane/supergravity bootstrap discussed in Section 5.3, as was the precise correspondence between the Kaluza-Klein mass spectrum in the bulk and the conformal dimension of operators on the boundary [123, 125]. Nevertheless, as we hope these lectures show, there are sufficently many similarities between the current bulk/boundary duality and the old Membrane at the End of the Universe idea to merit further comparisons.

5.8 Problems 5

1. Repeat the analysis of Section 5.5 for *rotating* branes.

6 ANTI-DE SITTER BLACK HOLES

6.1 Introduction

Anti-de Sitter black hole solutions of gauged extended supergravities [144] are currently attracting a good deal of attention [145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155] due, in large part, to the AdS/CFT correspondence. As we have seen, these gauged extended supergravities arise as the massless modes of various Kaluza-Klein compactifications of both $D = 11$ and $D = 10$ supergravities. The three examples studied in these lectures are gauged $D = 4$, $N = 8$ $SO(8)$ supergravity [157, 158] arising from $D = 11$ supergravity on S^7 [159, 20] whose black hole solutions are discussed in [150]; gauged $D = 5$, $N = 8$ $SO(6)$ supergravity [18, 27] arising from Type IIB supergravity on S^5 [23, 24, 25] whose black hole solutions are discussed in [145, 149]; and gauged $D = 7$, $N = 4$ $SO(5)$ supergravity [18, 19] arising from $D = 11$ supergravity on S^4 [17] whose black hole solutions are given in Section 6.8 and in [152, 63].[10] In the absence of the black holes, these three AdS compactifications are singled out as arising from the near-horizon geometry of the extremal non-rotating $M2$, $D3$ and $M5$ branes [64, 65, 66, 160]. One of our goals will be to embed these known lower-dimensional black hole solutions into ten or eleven dimensions, thus allowing a higher dimensional interpretation in terms of *rotating* $M2$, $D3$ and $M5$-branes.

Since these gauged supergravity theories may be obtained by consistently truncating the massive modes of the full Kaluza-Klein theories, it follows that all solutions of the lower-dimensional theories will also be solutions of the higher-dimensional ones [161, 162]. In principle, therefore, once we know the Kaluza-Klein ansatz for the massless sector, it ought to be straightforward to read off the higher dimensional solutions. It practice, however, this is a formidable task. The correct massless ansatz for the S^7 compactification took many years to finalize [163, 165], and is still highly implicit, while for the S^5 compactifications the complete massless ansätze are still unknown. The S^4 case has recently been given in its entirety in [223, 224]. For our present purposes, it suffices to consider truncations of the gauged supergravities to include only gauge fields in the Cartan subalgebras of the full gauge groups, namely $U(1)^4$, $U(1)^3$ and $U(1)^2$ for the S^7, S^5 and S^4 compactifications, respectively. These truncated theories will admit respectively the 4-charge AdS_4, 3-charge AdS_5 and 2-charge AdS_7 black hole solutions.

[10] BPS black holes arising in the $SU(2) \times SU(2)$ version of gauged $N = 4$ supergravity in $D = 4$, which is the massless sector of the $S^3 \times S^3$ compactification of $N = 1$ supergravity in $D = 10$, were discussed in [148]. These solutions are not asymptotically AdS.

The simplest of the three is perhaps the $D = 5$, $N = 8$ maximal gauged supergravity, for which there is a consistent $N = 2$ (*i.e.* minimal) truncation to supergravity coupled to two abelian vector multiplets. This has the bosonic field content of a graviton, three $U(1)$ gauge fields and two scalars. In these lectures we obtain the complete non-linear Kaluza-Klein ansatz for the compactification of $D = 10$ Type IIB supergravity on S^5, truncated to the $U(1)^3$ Cartan subgroup of $SO(6)$.

In four dimensions there is a consistent truncation of gauged $N = 8$ maximal supergravity to gauged $N = 2$ supergravity coupled to three vector multiplets. The bosonic sector consists of a graviton, four vectors and three complex scalars, whose real and imaginary parts correspond to three "axions" and three "dilatons." [11]. The inclusion of the axions is necessary for providing a consistent truncation; the full bosonic Lagrangian in this case is obtained in Appendix F. This truncation corresponds to the $U(1)^4$ Cartan subgroup of the non-abelian $SO(8)$, for which there exist AdS black hole solutions with four electric charges [150]. While one would ideally wish to obtain a complete Kaluza-Klein ansatz for the $N = 2$ truncation, in practice the complexity arising from the inclusion of the axions is considerable. Thus in these lectures we omit the axions in the Kaluza-Klein reduction. This is of course sufficient for the embedding of the electric black hole solutions in $D = 11$ as they do not involve the axions.

Finally, in seven dimensions, maximal $N = 4$ gauged $SO(5)$ supergravity admits a consistent truncation to $N = 2$ supergravity, comprising the metric, a 2-form potential, three vectors and a dilaton, coupled to a vector multiplet comprising a vector and three scalars. We obtain the Kaluza-Klein ansatz for an S^4 reduction of $D = 11$ supergravity, including two $U(1)^2$ gauge fields and two dilatonic scalars. This is sufficient for the consideration of the embedding of the $D = 7$ black holes in $D = 11$.

Having obtained the explicit Kaluza-Klein reduction ansätze, this allows an investigation of the embedding of the various AdS black holes of $D = 4$, $D = 5$ and $D = 7$ in the respective higher-dimensional supergravities. An important point here is that one must know the exact Kaluza-Klein reduction ansatz for the reduction of the supergravity theory itself, and not

[11] Interestingly enough, the ungauged version of this theory, obtained by switching off the gauge coupling and performing some dualisations, appears in the T^2 compactification of $D = 6$, $N = 1$ string theory. The four vectors are the two Kaluza-Klein and two winding gauge fields, while the three complex scalars S, T and U correspond to the axion-dilaton, the Kähler form and complex structure of the torus. This STU system plays a crucial role in four-dimensional string/string/string triality [166]. The black hole solutions of this theory [167, 166], and their embedding in ungauged $N = 8$ supergravity [168, 169] arising from the T^7 compactification of M-theory as intersections [170, 171] are also well known.

just for a specific solution, in order to show that the metric, gauge fields and scalar fields of the lower-dimensional solution are indeed precisely embeddable in the higher-dimensional theory. It is worth remarking, in this regard, that it is the scalar fields that present most of the subtleties and complexities in the implementation of the reduction procedure.

Having embedded these black holes in ten or eleven dimensions, an interesting question then arises as to their higher-dimensional interpretation. It was noted some time ago [45], in the context of a "test" membrane moving in a fixed $AdS_4 \times S^7$, that a 4-dimensional BPS state (whose AdS energy is equal to its electric charge) admits the eleven-dimensional interpretation of an $M2$-brane [41, 42, 51] that is rotating in the extra dimensions. Moreover, the electric charge is equal to the spin.

Recently there has been an upsurge of activities on the study of rotating p-branes [172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 151, 152, 153, 178, 179, 180, 181]. In particular, in [151] AdS Reissner-Nordström black holes (*i.e.* the charged black holes without scalars) of AdS supergavity in $D = 4$ and $D = 5$ were studied, and shown to be related to the rotating solutions of M-/string theory. In [152] the near-extreme spinning $D3$-brane with one angular momentum was shown to reproduce the metric and the gauge fields of the $k = 0^+$ limit of $D = 5$ gauged supergravity black holes [149], with the anticipation that the result would generalize to multiple angular momenta. However, the identification of the scalar fields was not given. In addition, in [152, 153], the equivalence of the thermodynamics of the near-extreme spinning branes and the corresponding large black holes of $D = 4,\ 5,\ 7$ gauged supergravity was given. While incomplete, these works provided some initial stages in the investigation of the sphere compactifications of M-/string theory.

Unlike black holes that are asymptotically Minkowskian, for which the horizons are always spherical, it is known that AdS black holes can also admit horizons of more general topology. Following the embedding procedure described above, we demonstrate that the AdS_4 black holes with toroidal horizon can indeed be interpreted as the near-horizon structures of an $M2$ brane rotating in the extra dimensions. The four charges corresponding to the $U(1)^4$ Cartan subgroup are just the four angular momenta. Similarly, the 5-dimensional charged black hole with toroidal horizon corresponds to a rotating $D3$-brane and the 7-dimensional charged black hole with toroidal horizon to a rotating $M5$-brane. In each case, the event horizon coincides with the worldvolume of the brane.[12] Additionally, one may use the Kaluza-Klein ansatz to obtain the higher-dimensional interpretation of AdS black holes with horizons of other topologies. We conjecture that these correspond to the near-horizon

[12]This is a concrete realisation of the "Membrane Paradigm" [182].

limits of rotating p-branes whose world-volumes have these topologies. (In fact the rotating "test" membrane in [45] had S^2 topology.)

In these lectures we also obtain the general rotating p-brane solutions in arbitrary dimensions, supported by a single $(p+2)$-form charge, and discuss their sphere reductions. These rotating p-branes are easily constructed, merely by performing standard diagonal dimensional oxidations of the general rotating black holes that were constructed in [172].

6.2 S^5 reduction of Type IIB supergravity

The S^5 reduction [23, 24, 25] of Type IIB supergravity gives rise to $N = 8$, $D = 5$ gauged supergravity, with $SO(6)$ Yang-Mills gauge group [18, 27]. The complete details of this reduction, as with any sphere reduction, would be of great complexity, and in fact no example has ever been fully worked out. For our present purposes, however, it suffices to consider the truncation of the five-dimensional theory to $N = 2$ supersymmetry. In this truncation, which is of course a consistent one, the gauge group is reduced down to the $U(1) \times U(1) \times U(1)$ Cartan subgroup of $SO(6)$. The bosonic sector of the theory comprises these three gauge bosons, the metric, and two scalar fields. (The consistency of the truncation to this field content can be seen by considering the S^1 reduction of ungauged minimal non-chiral supergravity in $D = 6$, whose bosonic fields $(g_{\mu\nu}, A_{(2)}, \phi)$ reduce to give precisely the field content we are considering here in $D = 5$. After gauging, one would obtain the $U(1)^3$ gauged theory.)

Even to construct the S^5 reduction ansatz for this truncated $N = 2$ theory is somewhat non-trivial, owing to the presence of the scalar fields. It is most conveniently expressed in terms of the parameterisation of sphere metrics given in [183].

We find that the ansatz for the reduction of the ten-dimensional metric is

$$ds_{10}^2 = \sqrt{\widetilde{\Delta}}\, ds_5^2 + \frac{1}{g^2\sqrt{\widetilde{\Delta}}} \sum_{i=1}^{3} X_i^{-1} \left(d\mu_i^2 + \mu_i^2 \, (d\phi_i + g\, A^i)^2 \right) , \tag{6.1}$$

where the two scalars are parameterised in terms of the three quantities X_i, which are subject to the constraint $X_1\, X_2\, X_3 = 1$. They can be parameterised in terms of two dilatons φ_1 and φ_2 as

$$X_i = e^{-\frac{1}{2}\vec{a}_i \cdot \vec{\varphi}} , \tag{6.2}$$

where $\vec{a}_i$ satisfy the dot products

$$M_{ij} \equiv \vec{a}_i \cdot \vec{a}_j = 4\delta_{ij} - \tfrac{4}{3} . \tag{6.3}$$

A convenient choice is

$$\vec{a}_1 = (\tfrac{2}{\sqrt{6}}, \sqrt{2}) \ , \qquad \vec{a}_2 = (\tfrac{2}{\sqrt{6}}, -\sqrt{2}) \ , \qquad \vec{a}_3 = (-\tfrac{4}{\sqrt{6}}, 0) \ . \tag{6.4}$$

The three quantities μ_i are subject to the constraint $\sum_i \mu_i^2 = 1$, and the metric on the unit round 5-sphere can be written in terms of these as

$$d\Omega_5^2 = \sum_i (d\mu_i^2 + \mu_i^2 \, d\phi_i^2) \ . \tag{6.5}$$

The μ_i can be parameterised in terms of angles on a 2-sphere, for example as

$$\mu_1 = \sin\theta \ , \qquad \mu_2 = \cos\theta \, \sin\psi \ , \qquad \mu_3 = \cos\theta \, \cos\psi \ . \tag{6.6}$$

Note that $\widetilde{\Delta}$ is given by

$$\widetilde{\Delta} = \sum_{i=1}^{3} X_i \, \mu_i^2 \ , \tag{6.7}$$

and is therefore expressed purely in terms of the scalar fields, and the coordinates on the compactifying 5-sphere. The constant g in (6.1) is the inverse of the radius of the compactifying 5-sphere, and is equal to the gauge coupling constant. We find that the ansatz for the reduction of the 5-form field strength is $F_{(5)} = G_{(5)} + *G_{(5)}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} G_{(5)} &= 2g \sum_i \Big(X_i^2 \, \mu_i^2 - \widetilde{\Delta} \, X_i \Big) \, \epsilon_{(5)} - \frac{1}{2g} \sum_i X_i^{-1} \, \bar{*} dX_i \wedge d(\mu_i^2) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2g^2} \sum_i X_i^{-2} \, d(\mu_i^2) \wedge (d\phi_i + g \, A^i_{(1)}) \wedge \bar{*} F^i_{(2)} \ . \end{aligned} \tag{6.8}$$

Here, $F^i_{(2)} = dA^i_{(1)}$, $\epsilon_{(5)}$ is the volume form of the 5-dimensional metric ds_5^2, and $\bar{*}$ denotes the Hodge dual with respect to the five-dimensional metric ds_5^2.

Substituting these ansätze into the equations for motion for the Type IIB theory, we obtain five-dimensional equations of motion that can be derived from the Lagrangian[13]

$$e^{-1} \, \mathcal{L}_5 = R - \tfrac{1}{2}(\partial\varphi_1)^2 - \tfrac{1}{2}(\partial\varphi_2)^2 + 4g^2 \sum_i X_i^{-1} - \tfrac{1}{4} \sum_i X_i^{-2} \, (F^i_{(2)})^2 + \tfrac{1}{4} \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma\lambda} \, F^1_{\mu\nu} \, F^2_{\rho\sigma} \, A^3_\lambda \ . \tag{6.9}$$

(The other bosonic fields of the type IIB theory are set to zero in this $U(1)^3$ truncated reduction.) Note that the ten-dimensional Bianchi identity $dF_{(5)} = 0$ gives rise to the equations of motion for the scalars and gauge fields in five dimensions.

Thus we have established that the reduction ansätze (6.1) and (6.8) describe the exact embedding of the five-dimensional $N = 2$ gauged $U(1)^3$ supergravity into Type IIB supergravity.

[13] We shall make some more detailed comments on certain general features of these spherical Kaluza-Klein reductions in Section 6.5, where we consider the S^7 reduction of $D = 11$ supergravity.

The bosonic Lagrangian (6.9) can be further truncated down to smaller sectors. For example, we can consistently set $\varphi_2 = 0$, implying that $X_1 = X_2 = X_3^{-1/2}$, provided that $F^1_{(2)} = F^2_{(2)} = F_{(2)}/\sqrt{2}$. The Lagrangian then becomes

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-1}\mathcal{L}_5 &= R - \tfrac{1}{2}(\partial\varphi_1)^2 + 4g^2\,(2e^{\frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}\varphi_1} + e^{-\frac{2}{\sqrt{6}}\varphi_1}) - \tfrac{1}{4}e^{\frac{2}{\sqrt{6}}\varphi_1}\,(F_{(2)})^2 - \tfrac{1}{4}e^{-\frac{4}{\sqrt{6}}\varphi_1}\,(F^3_{(2)})^2 \\ &\quad + \tfrac{1}{8}\epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma\lambda}\,F_{\mu\nu}\,F_{\rho\sigma}\,A^3_\lambda\ . \end{aligned} \tag{6.10}$$

It is also possible to set both scalars to zero, implying that $X_i = 1$, provided that $F^i_{(2)} = F_{(2)}/\sqrt{3}$. The Lagrangian is then given by

$$e^{-1}\mathcal{L}_5 = R + 12g^2 - \tfrac{1}{4}F^2_{(2)} + \tfrac{1}{12\sqrt{3}}\epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma\lambda}\,F_{\mu\nu}\,F_{\rho\sigma}\,A_\lambda\ . \tag{6.11}$$

The embedding of the truncated Lagrangian (6.11) in $D = 10$ dimensions was discussed in [151].

6.3 D=5 AdS black holes

The Lagrangian (6.9) admits a three-charge AdS black hole solution, given by [149]

$$\begin{aligned} ds_5^2 &= -(H_1H_2H_3)^{-2/3}\,f\,dt^2 + (H_1H_2H_3)^{1/3}\,(f^{-1}\,dr^2 + r^2 d\Omega^2_{3,k})\ , \\ X_i &= H_i^{-1}\,(H_1H_2H_3)^{1/3}\ , \qquad A^i_{(1)} = \sqrt{k}\,(1 - H_i^{-1})\,\coth\beta_i\,dt\ , \end{aligned} \tag{6.12}$$

and

$$f = k - \frac{\mu}{r^2} + g^2\,r^2\,(H_1H_2H_3)\ , \qquad H_i = 1 + \frac{\mu\,\sinh^2\beta_i}{k\,r^2}\ . \tag{6.13}$$

Here k can be 1, 0 or -1, corresponding to the foliating surfaces of the transverse space being S^3, T^3 or H^3, with unit metric $d\Omega^2_{3,k}$, where H^3 denotes the hyperbolic 3-space of constant negative curvature. In the case of $k = 0$, one first needs to make the rescaling [152] $\sinh^2\beta_i \longrightarrow k\,\sinh^2\beta_i$, followed by sending k to zero. The gauge potential for the $k = 0$ case is then given by

$$A^i_{(1)} = \frac{1 - H_i^{-1}}{\sinh\beta_i}\,dt\ . \tag{6.14}$$

6.4 Rotating D3-brane

In this section, we show that the $k = 0$ three-charge AdS black hole of the $N = 2$ gauged supergravity in $D = 5$ given in (6.12) can be embedded in $D = 10$ as a solution that is precisely the decoupling limit of the rotating $D3$-brane. The higher-dimensional solutions corresponding to five-dimensional AdS black holes with $k = 1$ and $k = -1$ can also be easily obtained, by substituting the five-dimensional solutions into the S^5 reduction ansätze.

There can be three angular momenta, ℓ_i, $i = 1, 2, 3$, in the rotating $D3$-brane. The generic single-charge rotating p-branes can be obtained by dimensional oxidation of the generic single-charge rotating black holes constructed in [172]. See problems of Section 6.15. We find that the metric of the rotating $D3$-brane is given by[14]

$$\begin{aligned} ds^2_{10} &= H^{-\frac{1}{2}}\Big(-(1-\frac{2m}{r^4\Delta})\, dt^2 + dx_1^2 + dx_2^2 + dx_3^2\Big) + H^{\frac{1}{2}}\Big[\frac{\Delta\, dr^2}{H_1H_2H_3 - 2m\, r^{-4}} \\ &\quad + r^2 \sum_{i=1}^{3} H_i\, (d\mu_i^2 + \mu_i^2\, d\phi_i^2) - \frac{4m\, \cosh\alpha}{r^4\, H\, \Delta}\, dt\, (\sum_{i=1}^{3} \ell_i\, \mu_i^2\, d\phi_i) \\ &\quad + \frac{2m}{r^4\, H\, \Delta}\, (\sum_{i=1}^{3} \ell_i\, \mu_i^2\, d\phi_i)^2\Big]\ , \end{aligned} \tag{6.15}$$

where the functions Δ, H, and H_i are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta &= H_1H_2H_3 \sum_{i=1}^{3} \frac{\mu_i^2}{H_i}\ , \qquad H = 1 + \frac{2m\, \sinh^2\alpha}{r^4\Delta}\ , \\ H_i &= 1 + \frac{\ell_i^2}{r^2}\ , \qquad i = 1, 2, 3\ . \end{aligned} \tag{6.16}$$

The rotating $D3$-brane is supported by the self-dual 5-form field strength $F_{(5)}$ of the type IIB theory. It is given by $F_{(5)} = G_{(5)} + *G_{(5)}$, where $G_{(5)} = dB_{(4)}$ and

$$B_{(4)} = \frac{1 - H^{-1}}{\sinh\alpha}\Big(-\cosh\alpha\, dt + \sum_{i=1}^{3} \ell_i\, \mu_i^2\, d\phi_i\Big) \wedge d^3x\ . \tag{6.17}$$

As is well known, the non-rotating $D3$-brane has a "decoupling limit" where the spacetime of the $D3$-brane becomes a product space $M_5 \times S^5$. If the $D3$-brane is extremal, M_5 is a five-dimensional anti-de Sitter spacetime. More generally, when the $D3$-brane is non-extremal, M_5 is the Carter-Novotny-Horsky metric [184], which can thus be viewed as a "non-extremal" generalisation of AdS_5. A similar limit also exists for the rotating $D3$-brane, and can be achieved by making the rescalings

$$\begin{aligned} &m \longrightarrow \epsilon^4\, m\ , \qquad \sinh\alpha \longrightarrow \epsilon^{-2}\, \sinh\alpha\ , \\ &r \longrightarrow \epsilon\, r\ , \qquad x^\mu \longrightarrow \epsilon^{-1}\, x^\mu\ , \qquad \ell_i \to \epsilon\, \ell_i\ , \end{aligned} \tag{6.18}$$

and then sending $\epsilon \longrightarrow 0$. (Note that when this limit is taken, we also have $\cosh\alpha \longrightarrow \epsilon^{-2}\, \sinh\alpha$.) This has the effect that the last term in (6.15) is set to zero and that

$$H = 1 + \frac{2m\, \sinh^2\alpha}{r^4\Delta} \longrightarrow \frac{2m\, \sinh^2\alpha}{r^4\Delta}\ . \tag{6.19}$$

[14] This metric agrees with previously obtained results [178, 179], after correcting some typographical errors.

In this limit, the metric (6.15) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} ds_{10}^2 &= \sqrt{\widetilde{\Delta}}\Big[-(H_1H_2H_3)^{-2/3}\, f\, dt^2 + (H_1H_2H_3)^{1/3}(f^{-1}\, dr^2 + r^2\, d\vec{y}\cdot d\vec{y})\Big] \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{g^2\sqrt{\widetilde{\Delta}}}\sum_{i=1}^{3} X_i^{-1}\left(d\mu_i^2 + \mu_i^2\,(d\phi_i + g\,A^i)^2\right)\,, \end{aligned} \tag{6.20}$$

where

$$\vec{y} = g\,\vec{x}\,, \qquad g^2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2m}\,\sinh\alpha}\,, \qquad \mu = 2m\,g^2\,. \tag{6.21}$$

The metric (6.20) precisely matches the dimensional reduction ansatz (6.1), with the lower dimensional fields given by

$$\begin{aligned} ds_5^2 &= -(H_1H_2H_3)^{-2/3}\, f\, dt^2 + (H_1\,H_2\,H_3)^{1/3}(f^{-1}\, dr^2 + r^2\, d\vec{y}\cdot d\vec{y})\,, \\ X_i &= H_i^{-1}\,(H_1H_2H_3)^{1/3}\,, \qquad A^i_{(1)} = \frac{1 - H_i^{-1}}{g\,\ell_i\,\sinh\alpha}\,dt\,, \end{aligned} \tag{6.22}$$

where

$$f = -\frac{\mu}{r^2} + g^2\,r^2\,H_1H_2H_3\,, \qquad g^2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2m}\sinh\alpha}\,, \qquad \mu = 2m\,g^2\,. \tag{6.23}$$

To complete the story, we note that the 5-form field strength in the decoupling limit is given by $F_{(5)} = G_{(5)} + *G_{(5)}$, where $G_{(5)} = dB_{(4)}$ and

$$B_{(4)} = -g^4\,r^4\,\Delta\,dt\wedge d^3x + \frac{1}{\sinh\alpha}\,(\sum_{i=1}^{3}\ell_i\,\mu_i^2\,d\phi_i)\wedge d^3x\,. \tag{6.24}$$

This gives precisely the field strength in the dimensional reduction ansatz (6.8).

Thus we see that the solution (6.22) is precisely the $k = 0$ three-charge AdS black hole given in the previous subsection, after reparameterising the angular momenta $\ell_i^2 = \mu\sinh^2\beta_i$. This shows that the embedding of the three-charge AdS $k = 0$ black hole in gauged $N = 2$ supergravity in five dimensions gives a ten-dimensional solution that is precisely the decoupling limit of the rotating $D3$-brane. Single-charge AdS black holes coming from the reduction of the metric of a rotating $D3$-brane with one angular momentum were obtained in [152], however without the explicit embedding of the scalar fields. The connection between the thermodynamics of AdS black holes and rotating p-branes was discussed in [152, 153].

It is also straightforward to oxidise the $k = 1$ and $k = -1$ AdS black holes back to $D = 10$ type IIB. The metric is the same form as (6.20) with $d\vec{y}\cdot d\vec{y}$ replaced by the unit metric for S^3 or H^3 respectively. The 5-form field strength follows by substituting the five-dimensional fields into (6.8).

6.5 S^7 reduction of D=11 supergravity

The S^7 reduction of eleven-dimensional supergravity gives rise to $SO(8)$ gauged $N = 8$ supergravity in four dimensions. One may again consider a consistent truncation to $N = 2$, for which the bosonic sector comprises the metric, four commuting $U(1)$ gauge potentials, three dilatons and three axions. (That this is a consistent truncation can be seen by reducing minimal non-chiral six-dimensional supergravity on T^2, for which the reduction of $(g_{\mu\nu}, A_{(2)}, \phi)$ will give precisely the field content we are considering. After gauging, this would give the $U(1)^4$ gauged theory. See Appendix F for an extended discussion of this.) We have not yet determined the complete reduction ansatz for the entire truncated theory where the axions are included, but we can give the exact ansatz in the case where one sets the axions to zero. This will not, of course, be a consistent truncation, since the $U(1)$ gauge fields will provide source terms of the form $\epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} F_{\mu\nu} F_{\rho\sigma}$ for the axions. Nevertheless, one can use the axion-free ansatz for discussing the exact embedding of four-dimensional solutions for which the axions are zero. The full $N = 2$ four-dimensional theory, including the axions, is obtained in Appendix F.

The reduction ansatz for the eleven-dimensional metric is

$$ds_{11}^2 = \widetilde{\Delta}^{2/3}\, ds_4^2 + g^{-2}\, \widetilde{\Delta}^{-1/3} \sum_i X_i^{-1} \Big(d\mu_i^2 + \mu_i^2\, (d\phi_i + g\, A_{(1)}^i)^2 \Big) \ . \tag{6.25}$$

where $\widetilde{\Delta} = \sum_{i=1}^4 X_i\, \mu_i^2$. The four quantities μ_i satisfy $\sum_i \mu_i^2 = 1$. They can be parameterised in terms of angles on the 3-sphere as

$$\mu_1 = \sin\theta \ , \quad \mu_2 = \cos\theta\, \sin\varphi \ , \quad \mu_3 = \cos\theta\, \cos\varphi\, \sin\psi \ , \quad \mu_4 = \cos\theta\, \cos\varphi\, \cos\psi \ . \tag{6.26}$$

The four X_i, which satisfy $X_1X_2X_3X_4 = 1$, can be parameterised in terms of three dilatonic scalars $\vec{\varphi} = (\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \varphi_3)$:

$$X_i = e^{-\frac{1}{2}\vec{a}_i\cdot\vec{\varphi}} \ , \tag{6.27}$$

where the $\vec{a}_i$ satisfy the dot products

$$M_{ij} \equiv \vec{a}_i \cdot \vec{a}_j = 4\delta_{ij} - 1 \ . \tag{6.28}$$

A convenient choice, corresponding to the combinations of (F.11), is

$$\vec{a}_1 = (1,1,1) \ , \quad \vec{a}_2 = (1,-1,-1) \ , \quad \vec{a}_3 = (-1,1,-1) \ , \quad \vec{a}_4 = (-1,-1,1) \ . \tag{6.29}$$

The reduction ansatz for the 4-form field strength is

$$\begin{aligned} F_{(4)} \ &= \ 2g \sum_i \Big(X_i^2\, \mu_i^2 - \widetilde{\Delta}\, X_i \Big)\, \epsilon_{(4)} + \frac{1}{2g} \sum_i X_i^{-1}\, \overline{*} dX_i \wedge d(\mu_i^2) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2g^2} \sum_i X_i^{-2}\, d(\mu_i^2) \wedge (d\phi_i + g\, A_{(1)}^i) \wedge \overline{*} F_{(2)}^i \ . \end{aligned} \tag{6.30}$$

Here, $\bar{*}$ denotes the Hodge dual with respect to the four-dimensional metric ds_4^2, and $\epsilon_{(4)}$ denotes its volume form.[15]

It is of interest to note that the eleven-dimensional Bianchi identity $dF_{(4)} = 0$ already gives rise to the four-dimensional equations of motion for the scalars and gauge potentials, namely

$$\begin{aligned} d\bar{*}d\log(X_i) &= \tfrac{1}{4}\sum_j M_{ij}\, X_j^{-2}\, \bar{*}F^j_{(2)} \wedge F^j_{(2)} + g^2 \sum_{j,k} M_{ij}\, X_j\, X_k - g^2 \sum_j M_{ij} X_j^2 \ , \\ d(X_i^{-2}\, \bar{*}F^i_{(2)}) &= 0 \ . \end{aligned} \tag{6.31}$$

It is straightforward to see that these equations of motion can be obtained from the four-dimensional Lagrangian

$$e^{-1}\mathcal{L}_4 = R - \tfrac{1}{2}(\partial\vec{\varphi})^2 + 8g^2(\cosh\varphi_1 + \cosh\varphi_2 + \cosh\varphi_3) - \tfrac{1}{4}\sum_{i=1}^4 e^{\vec{a}_i\cdot\vec{\varphi}}\,(F^i_{(2)})^2 \ . \tag{6.32}$$

One might think that it would be possible to obtain the four-dimensional Lagrangian by substituting the ansätze (6.25) and (6.30) into the eleven-dimensional Lagrangian. In fact this is not the case, and one must work at the level of the eleven-dimensional equations of motion. One way of understanding this is from the fact that the ansatz for $F_{(4)}$ does not *identically* satisfy the Bianchi identity. Rather, as we have seen, it satisfies it modulo the use of the four-dimensional equations of motion for the scalars and gauge fields. In other words, the ansatz is made on the eleven-dimensional 4-form $F_{(4)}$ rather than on the fundamental potential $A_{(3)}$ itself. Consequently, it would not be correct to insert the ansatz for $F_{(4)}$ into the Lagrangian.

We may further illustrate this point by showing, as an example, how the scalar potential arises in the four-dimensional Einstein equation. This comes from considering the eleven-dimensional Einstein equation,

$$\hat{R}_{AB} - \tfrac{1}{2}\hat{R}\,\eta_{AB} = \tfrac{1}{12}\Big(F^2_{AB} - \tfrac{1}{8}F^2\,\eta_{AB}\Big) \ . \tag{6.33}$$

with vielbein indices A, B ranging just over the four-dimensional spacetime directions α, β. From the ansatz (6.25), the relevant terms in the eleven-dimensional Ricci tensor and Ricci scalar are given by

$$\hat{R}_{\alpha\beta} = \frac{4g^2}{3\widetilde{\Delta}^{8/3}}\Big[-\Big(\sum_i X_i^2\,\mu_i^2\Big)^2 + \widetilde{\Delta}\sum_i X_i^2\,\mu_i^2 \sum_j X_j + \widetilde{\Delta}\sum_i X_i^3\,\mu_i^2$$

[15] If the ansätze (6.25) and (6.30) are linearised around an $AdS_4 \times S^7$ background, they can be seen to be in agreement with previous results that were derived at the linear level [159]. The full non-linear metric ansatz (6.25) should be in agreement with the appropriate specialisation of the ansatz given in [185].

$$-\widetilde{\Delta}^2 \sum_i X_i^2\Big]\,\eta_{\alpha\beta} + \widetilde{\Delta}^{-2/3}\, R_{\alpha\beta} + \cdots\ , \tag{6.34}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{R} \;=\; & \frac{2g^2}{3\widetilde{\Delta}^{8/3}}\Big[-\Big(\sum_i X_i^2\,\mu_i^2\Big)^2 - 2\widetilde{\Delta}\sum_i X_i^2\,\mu_i^2\sum_j X_j + 4\widetilde{\Delta}\sum_i X_i^3\,\mu_i^2 \\ & +6\widetilde{\Delta}^2\Big(\sum_i X_i\Big)^2 - 7\widetilde{\Delta}^2\sum_i X_i^2\Big] + \widetilde{\Delta}^{-2/3}\,R + \cdots\ ,\end{aligned} \tag{6.35}$$

where $R_{\alpha\beta}$ and R are the four-dimensional Ricci tensor and scalar, and the ellipsis indicate that terms not involving purely the undifferentiated scalars have been omitted for the purposes of the present illustrative discussion. From the ansatz (6.30) for the 4-form, the eleven-dimensional energy-momentum tensor vielbein components in the four-dimensional spacetime directions are given by

$$\tfrac{1}{12}(F^2_{\alpha\beta} - \tfrac{1}{8}F^2\,\eta_{a\beta}) = -g^2\,\widetilde{\Delta}^{-8/3}\Big(\sum_i (X_i^2\,\mu_i^2 - \widetilde{\Delta}\,X_i)\Big)^2\,\eta_{\alpha\beta}\ . \tag{6.36}$$

Substituting (6.34), (6.35) and (6.36) into (6.33), we find that all the angular dependence coming from the μ_i variables cancels, and that the scalar potential terms in the four-dimensional Einstein equation are given by

$$R_{\alpha\beta} - \tfrac{1}{2}R\,\eta_{\alpha\beta} = -\tfrac{1}{2}g^2\,V\,\eta_{\alpha\beta}\ , \tag{6.37}$$

with V given by

$$V = -4\sum_{i<j} X_i\,X_j = -8(\cosh\varphi_1 + \cosh\varphi_2 + \cosh\varphi_3)\ . \tag{6.38}$$

Since (6.37) derives from the Lagrangian $R - g^2\,V$, we see that we have precisely produced the hoped-for potential terms of the gauged supergravity Lagrangian (6.32). This sample calculation also serves to illustrate that the angular dependence coming from the μ_i variables would not have cancelled if we had merely substituted the ansätze (6.25) and (6.30) into the eleven-dimensional Lagrangian. It also shows that the cancellation of the μ_i dependence in the higher-dimensional equations of motion depends crucially on "conspiracies" between the contributions from the metric and the 4-form field strength. This is quite different from the situation in toroidal reductions, where each term in the higher-dimensional theory reduces consistently by itself, without the need for any such conspiracies. Note, furthermore, that the required conspiracies needed for the success of the spherical reduction depend on the 4-form field strength occurring with precisely the correct coefficient relative to the Einstein-Hilbert term. This normalisation is not a free parameter, but is governed by the strength of the FFA term in the eleven-dimensional theory. Thus ultimately the consistency of

the spherical reduction ansatz can be traced back to the supersymmetry of the eleven-dimensional theory.

Note that the Lagrangian (6.32) can be further truncated, to pure Einstein-Maxwell with a cosmological constant, by setting all the field strengths equal, $F^i_{(2)} = \frac{1}{2}F_{(2)}$, and setting all the scalars to zero:

$$e^{-1}\mathcal{L}_4 = R - \tfrac{1}{4}(F_{(2)})^2 + 24g^2 \ . \tag{6.39}$$

The embedding of this theory into $D = 11$ supergravity was obtained in [162]. The ansatz for the metric and field strength for the embedding in [162] was given in terms of a decomposition of the 7-sphere as a $U(1)$ bundle over CP^3. This is identical, after a transformation of coordinates, to the Einstein-Maxwell embedding given in [151]. In the same spirit, the S^5 reduction to five-dimensional Einstein-Maxwell can be described using the method presented in [162], with S^5 viewed as a $U(1)$ bundle over CP^2. (An analogous consistent embedding of four-dimensional Einstein-Yang-Mills with an $SU(2)$ gauge group, and a cosmological constant, in $D = 11$ supergravity was obtained in [186]. This involves a decomposition of S^7 as an $SU(2)$ bundle over S^4.)

6.6 D=4 AdS black holes

The $D = 4$, $N = 2$ gauged supergravity coupled to three vector multiplets admits 4-charge AdS black hole solutions, given by [150, 154]

$$\begin{aligned} ds_4^2 &= -(H_1H_2H_3H_4)^{-1/2}\, f\, dt^2 + (H_1H_2H_3H_4)^{1/2}\,(f^{-1}\, dr^2 + r^2 d\Omega^2_{2,k}) \ , \\ X_i &= H_i^{-1}\,(H_1H_2H_3H_4)^{1/4} \ , \qquad A^i_{(1)} = \sqrt{k}\,(1 - H_i^{-1})\,\coth\beta_i\, dt \ , \end{aligned} \tag{6.40}$$

and

$$f = k - \frac{\mu}{r} + 4g^2\, r^2\,(H_1H_2H_3H_4) \ , \qquad H_i = 1 + \frac{\mu\,\sinh^2\beta_i}{k\, r} \ . \tag{6.41}$$

Here, k can be 1, 0 or -1, corresponding to the cases where the foliations in the transverse space have the metric $d\Omega^2_{2,k}$ on the unit S^2, T^2 or H^2, where H^2 is the unit hyperbolic 2-space of constant negative curvature. In the case of $k = 0$, one must first make the rescaling $\sinh^2\beta_i \longrightarrow k\,\sinh^2\beta_i$ before sending k to zero. The gauge potential for the $k = 0$ case is then given by

$$A^i_{(1)} = \frac{1 - H_i^{-1}}{\sinh\beta_i}\, dt \ . \tag{6.42}$$

6.7 Rotating M2-brane

There are four angular momenta, ℓ_i, $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$, in the rotating $M2$-brane. The solution can be obtained by oxidising the $D = 9$ rotating black hole [172]. After the oxidation, we find that the metric of the rotating $M2$-brane is given by

$$\begin{aligned} ds_{11}^2 &= H^{-\frac{2}{3}}\Big(-(1-\frac{2m}{r^6\,\Delta})\,dt^2 + dx_1^2 + dx_2^2\Big) + H^{\frac{1}{3}}\Big[\frac{\Delta\,dr^2}{H_1\,H_2\,H_3\,H_4 - \frac{2m}{r^6}} \\ &\quad + r^2\sum_{i=1}^{4} H_i\,(d\mu_i^2 + \mu_i^2\,d\phi_i^2) - \frac{4m\,\cosh\alpha}{r^6\,H\,\Delta}\,dt(\sum_{i=1}^{4}\ell_i\,\mu_i^2\,d\phi_i) \\ &\quad + \frac{2m}{r^4\,H\,\Delta}\,(\sum_{i=1}^{4}\ell_i\,\mu_i^2\,d\phi_i)^2\Big]\,, \end{aligned} \tag{6.43}$$

where the functions Δ, H and H_i are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta &= H_1H_2H_3H_4\sum_{i=1}^{4}\frac{\mu_i^2}{H_i}\,, \qquad H = 1 + \frac{2m\,\sinh^2\alpha}{r^6\,\Delta}\,, \\ H_i &= 1 + \frac{\ell_i^2}{r^2}\,, \qquad i = 1, 2, 3, 4\,. \end{aligned} \tag{6.44}$$

The 3-form gauge potential is given by

$$A_{(3)} = \frac{1 - H^{-1}}{\sinh\alpha}(-\cosh\alpha\,dt + \ell_i\,\mu_i^2\,d\phi_i)\wedge d^2x\,. \tag{6.45}$$

Following the previous $D3$-brane example, we consider the decoupling limit, which is obtained by making the rescaling

$$\begin{aligned} &m \longrightarrow \epsilon^6 m\,, \qquad \sinh\alpha \longrightarrow \epsilon^{-3}\,\sinh\alpha\,, \\ &r \longrightarrow \epsilon\,r\,, \qquad x^\mu \longrightarrow \epsilon^{-2}\,x^\mu\,, \qquad \ell_i \to \epsilon\,\ell_i \end{aligned} \tag{6.46}$$

and then sending $\epsilon \longrightarrow 0$. This has the effect that the last term in (6.43) is set to zero and that the 1 in function H (6.44) is removed. In this limit, the rotating $M2$-brane (6.43) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} ds_{11}^2 &= \widetilde{\Delta}^{2/3}\Big[-(H_1H_2H_3H_4)^{-1/2}\,f\,dt^2 + (H_1H_2H_3H_4)^{1/2}\,(f^{-1}\,d\rho^2 + \rho^2 d\vec{y}\cdot d\vec{y})\Big] \\ &\quad + g^{-2}\,\widetilde{\Delta}^{-1/3}\sum_{i=1}^{4}X_i^{-1}\Big(d\mu_i^2 + \mu_i^2\,(d\phi_i + g\,A^i)^2\Big)\,, \end{aligned} \tag{6.47}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} &\rho = \tfrac{1}{2}g\,r^2\,, \qquad \vec{y} = 2g\,\vec{x}\,, \qquad f = -\frac{\mu}{\rho} + 4g^2\,\rho^2\,H_1H_2H_3H_4\,, \\ &g^2 = (2m\,\sinh^2\alpha)^{-1/3}\,, \qquad \mu = m\,g^5\,, \qquad \widetilde{\Delta} = \sum_i X_i\,\mu_i^2\,. \end{aligned} \tag{6.48}$$

This is precisely of the form of the metric ansatz in the dimensional reduction given by (6.25). The lower dimensional fields are given by

$$\begin{aligned} ds_4^2 &= -(H_1H_2H_3H_4)^{-1/2}\, f\, dt^2 + (H_1H_2H_3H_4)^{1/2}\,(f^{-1}\, d\rho^2 + \rho^2 d\vec{x}\cdot d\vec{x}) \\ X_i &= H_i^{-1}\,(H_1H_2H_3H_4)^{1/4}\ , \qquad A^i = \frac{1-H_i^{-1}}{g\,\ell_i\,\sinh\alpha}\, dt\ . \end{aligned} \tag{6.49}$$

In the decoupling limit, the gauge potential $A_{(3)}$ given in (6.45) for the rotating $M2$-brane becomes, after a gauge transformation,

$$A_{(3)} = -g^6\, r^6\, \Delta\, dt\wedge d^2x + \frac{1}{\sinh\alpha}\,\sum_i \ell_i\,\mu_i^2\, d\phi_i\wedge d^2x\ . \tag{6.50}$$

We find that its field strength $F_{(4)} = dA_{(3)}$ is also of the form given in (6.30) for the dimensional reduction ansatz. Thus we have established an exact embedding of four-dimensional non-extremal 4-charge AdS black holes into eleven-dimensional supergravity, and furthermore, that they become precisely the decoupling limit of the rotating $M2$-branes. It should, of course, be emphasised that the four-dimensional AdS black holes that we are considering at this point have T^2 rather than S^2 horizons, corresponding to $k=0$ in (6.40) and (6.41).

It is also straightforward to oxidise the $k=1$ and $k=-1$ AdS black hole solutions back to $D=11$, by substituting the four-dimensional fields into the ansätze (6.25) and (6.30).

6.8 S^4 reduction of D=11 supergravity

The Kaluza-Klein reduction of eleven-dimensional supergravity on S^4 gives rise to $N=4$ gauged $SO(5)$ supergravity in seven dimensions. In a similar manner to the S^5 and S^7 reductions that we discussed previously, we may consider an $N=2$ truncation of this seven-dimensional theory. As described in the introduction, the truncated theory comprises $N=2$ supergravity coupled to a vector multiplet, comprising the metric, 2-form potential, four vector potentials and four scalars in total. For our present purposes, we shall focus on a further truncation where only the metric, two gauge potentials (which are associated with the $U(1)\times U(1)$ Cartan subgroup of $SO(5)$) and two scalars are retained. This is not in general a consistent truncation, but, as in the case of the neglect of the axions in the S^7 reduction, it is consistent for a subset of solutions where the truncated fields are not excited by the ones that are retained. In particular, solutions of the $N=2$ theory for which $F^1_{(2)}\wedge F^2_{(2)}=0$, such as the AdS black holes, will also be solutions of this truncated theory.

We find that we can obtain this truncated theory by making the following Kaluza-Klein S^4-reduction ansatz:

$$ds_{11}^2 \;=\; \widetilde{\Delta}^{1/3}\, ds_7^2 + g^{-2}\,\widetilde{\Delta}^{-2/3}\,\Big(X_0^{-1}\, d\mu_0^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{2} X_i^{-1}\,(d\mu_i^2 + \mu_i^2\,(d\phi_i + g\,A^i_{(1)})^2)\Big) \tag{6.51}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
F_{(4)} &= 2g\sum_{\alpha=0}^{2}\Big(X_\alpha^2\,\mu_\alpha^2-\widetilde{\Delta}\,X_\alpha\Big)\,\epsilon_{(7)}+g\,\widetilde{\Delta}\,X_0\,\epsilon_{(7)}+\frac{1}{2g}\sum_{\alpha=0}^{2}X_\alpha^{-1}\,\bar{}dX_\alpha\wedge d(\mu_\alpha^2)\\
&\quad+\frac{1}{2g^2}\sum_{i=1}^{2}X_i^{-2}\,d(\mu_i^2)\wedge(d\phi_i+g\,A^i_{(1)})\wedge\bar{*}F^i_{(2)}\ ,
\end{aligned}
\tag{6.52}
$$

where we have defined the auxiliary variable $X_0\equiv(X_1X_2)^{-2}$. Here, $\bar{*}$ denotes the Hodge dual with respect to the seven-dimensional metric ds_7^2, $\epsilon_{(7)}$ denotes its volume form, and $*$ denotes the Hodge dualisation in the eleven-dimensional metric. The quantity $\widetilde{\Delta}$ is given by

$$
\widetilde{\Delta}=\sum_{\alpha=0}^{2}X_\alpha\,\mu_\alpha^2\ ,
\tag{6.53}
$$

where μ_0, μ_1 and μ_2 satisfy $\mu_0^2+\mu_1^2+\mu_2^2=1$. The two scalar fields X_i can be parameterised in terms of two canonically-normalised dilatons $\vec{\varphi}=(\varphi_1,\varphi_2)$ by writing

$$
X_i=e^{-\frac{1}{2}\vec{a}_i\cdot\vec{\varphi}}\ ,
\tag{6.54}
$$

where the dilaton vectors satisfy the relations $\vec{a}_i\cdot\vec{a}_j=4\delta_{ij}-\frac{8}{5}$. A convenient parameterisation is given by

$$
\vec{a}_1=(\sqrt{2},\sqrt{\tfrac{2}{5}})\ ,\qquad \vec{a}_2=(-\sqrt{2},\sqrt{\tfrac{2}{5}})\ .
\tag{6.55}
$$

Note that the two X_i are independent here, unlike in the cases of the three X_i in $D=5$ or the four X_i in $D=4$, which satisfied $\prod_i X_i=1$. The auxiliary variable X_0 that we have introduced in order to make the expressions more symmetrical can be written as $X_0=e^{-\frac{1}{2}\vec{a}_0\cdot\vec{\varphi}}$, where $\vec{a}_0=-2(\vec{a}_1+\vec{a}_2)=(0,-4\sqrt{2/5})$.

After substituting into the eleven-dimensional equations of motion, one obtains seven-dimensional equations that can be derived from the Lagrangian

$$
e^{-1}\mathcal{L}_7=R-\tfrac{1}{2}(\partial\vec{\varphi})^2-g^2\,V-\tfrac{1}{4}\sum_{i=1}^{2}e^{\vec{a}_i\cdot\vec{\varphi}}\,(F^i_{(2)})^2\ ,
\tag{6.56}
$$

where the potential V is given by

$$
V=-4X_1X_2-2X_1^{-1}X_2^{-2}-2X_2^{-1}X_1^{-2}+\tfrac{1}{2}(X_1X_2)^{-4}\ .
\tag{6.57}
$$

This potential has a more complicated structure than those in the $D=5$ and $D=4$ gauged theories, and in particular it has not only a maximum at $X_1=X_2=1$, but also a saddle point at $X_1=X_2=2^{-1/5}$ [187]. Note that by making use of the auxiliary variable $X_0=(X_1X_2)^{-2}$, the potential can be re-expressed as

$$
V=-4X_1X_2-2X_0X_1-2X_0X_2+\tfrac{1}{2}X_0^2\ .
\tag{6.58}
$$

It is interesting to note that the Lagrangian (6.56) can be further consistently truncated, by setting $X_1 = X_2 = X$, and $F^1_{(2)} = F^2_{(2)} = F_{(2)}/\sqrt{2}$. This implies that the dilatonic scalar φ_1 is set to zero, in terms of the parameterisation defined by (6.55). This gives

$$e^{-1}\mathcal{L}_7 = R - \tfrac{1}{2}(\partial\varphi_2)^2 + g^2\,(4X^2 + 4X^{-3} - \tfrac{1}{2}X^{-8}) - \tfrac{1}{4}X^{-2}\,(F_{(2)})^2\ , \qquad (6.59)$$

where

$$X = e^{-\frac{1}{\sqrt{10}}\varphi_2}\ . \qquad (6.60)$$

This scalar potential was used in [188] to construct supersymmetric domain wall solutions.

6.9 D=7 AdS black holes

This Lagrangian (6.56) admits 2-charge AdS black-hole solutions, given by

$$\begin{aligned} ds_7^2 &= -(H_1H_2)^{-4/5}\,f\,dt^2 + (H_1H_2)^{1/5}\,(f^{-1}\,dr^2 + r^2\,d\Omega^2_{5,k})\ , \\ f &= k - \frac{\mu}{r^4} + \tfrac{1}{4}g^2\,r^2\,H_1H_2\ , \qquad X_i = (H_1H_2)^{2/5}\,H_i^{-1}\ , \\ A^i_{(1)} &= \sqrt{k}\,\coth\beta_i\,(1 - H_i^{-1})\,dt\ , \qquad H_i = 1 + \frac{\mu\,\sinh^2\beta_i}{r^4}\ , \end{aligned} \qquad (6.61)$$

where $d\Omega^2_{5,k}$ is the metric on a unit S^5, T^5 or H^5 according to whether $k = 1, 0$ or -1. As in the previous cases we discussed, the $k = 0$ solution is obtained by first rescaling $\sinh^2\beta_i \longrightarrow k\,\sinh^2\beta_i$ before setting $k = 0$. The metric of the $D = 7$ AdS black hole was obtained in [152], by isolating the spacetime direction of the rotating $M5$-brane metric.

6.10 Rotating M5-brane

There are two angular momenta, ℓ_1 and ℓ_2, in the rotating $M5$-brane [173, 180]. Its metric is given by

$$\begin{aligned} ds_{11}^2 &= H^{-1/3}\Big(-(1 - \frac{2m}{r^3\Delta})\,dt^2 + dx_1^2 + \cdots + dx_5^2\Big) + H^{2/3}\Big[\frac{\Delta\,dr^2}{H_1H_2 - \frac{2m}{r^3}} \\ &\quad + r^2\Big(d\mu_0^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{2} H_i(d\mu_i^2 + \mu_i^2\,d\phi_i^2)\Big) - \frac{4m\,\cosh\alpha}{r^3\,H\,\Delta}\,dt\,(\sum_{i=1}^{2}\ell_i\,\mu_i^2\,d\phi_i)^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{2m}{r^3\,H\,\Delta}(\sum_{i=1}^{2}\ell_i\,\mu_i^2\,d\phi_i)^2\Big]\ , \end{aligned} \qquad (6.62)$$

where Δ, H and H_i are given by

$$\begin{aligned} &\Delta = H_1H_2(\mu_0^2 + \frac{\mu_1^2}{H_1} + \frac{\mu_2^2}{H_2})\ , \qquad H = 1 + \frac{2m\,\sinh^2\alpha}{r^3\,\Delta}\ , \\ &H_1 = 1 + \frac{\ell_1^2}{r^2}\ , \qquad H_2 = 1 + \frac{\ell_2^2}{r^2}\ . \end{aligned} \qquad (6.63)$$

The three quantities μ_0, μ_1 and μ_2 satisfy $\mu_0^2 + \mu_1^2 + \mu_2^2 = 1$. The 4-form field strength is given by $F_4 = *dA_6$, where

$$A_6 = \frac{1 - H^{-1}}{\sinh\alpha}(\cosh\alpha\, dt + \ell_1\, \mu_1^2\, d\phi_1 + \ell_2\, \mu_2^2\, d\phi_2) \wedge d^5x \ . \tag{6.64}$$

The decoupling limit is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} &m \longrightarrow \epsilon^3\, m \ , \qquad \sinh\alpha \longrightarrow \epsilon^{-3/2}\, \sinh\alpha \ , \\ &r \longrightarrow \epsilon\, r \ , \qquad x^\mu \longrightarrow \epsilon^{-1/2}\, x^\mu \ , \qquad \ell_i \longrightarrow \epsilon\, \ell_i \ , \end{aligned} \tag{6.65}$$

with $\epsilon \longrightarrow 0$. In this limit, the metric becomes

$$\begin{aligned} ds_{11}^2 \ &= \ \widetilde{\Delta}^{1/3}\Big[-(H_1H_2)^{-4/5}\, f\, dt^2 + (H_1H_2)^{1/5}\, (f^{-1}\, d\rho^2 + \rho^2\, d\vec{y}\cdot d\vec{y})\Big] \\ &\quad + g^{-2}\, \widetilde{\Delta}^{-2/3}\, \Big((X_1X_2)^2\, d\mu_0^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{2} X_i^{-1}\, (d\mu_i^2 + \mu_i^2 (d\phi_i + g\, A^i_{(1)})^2)\Big) \ . \end{aligned} \tag{6.66}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} &\rho^2 = 4r\, g^{-1} \ , \qquad \vec{y} = \tfrac{1}{2} g\, \vec{x} \ , \qquad \widetilde{\Delta} = (X_1X_2)^{-2}\, \mu_0^2 + X_1\, \mu_1^2 + X_2\, \mu_2^2 \ , \\ &g^2 = (2m\, \sinh^2\alpha)^{-2/3} \ , \qquad \mu = 32m\, g^{-1} \ . \end{aligned} \tag{6.67}$$

The metric (6.66) fits precisely the dimensional reduction ansatz given in (6.51). The lower dimensional fields are given by

$$\begin{aligned} ds_7^2 \ &= \ -(H_1H_2)^{-4/5}\, f\, dt^2 + (H_1H_2)^{1/5}\, (f^{-1}\, d\rho^2 + \rho^2\, d\vec{y}\cdot d\vec{y}) \ , \\ X_i \ &= \ (H_1H_2)^{2/5}\, H_i^{-1} \ , \qquad f = -\frac{\mu}{\rho^4} + \tfrac{1}{4} g^2 \rho^2\, H_1H_2 \ , \\ A^i_{(1)} \ &= \ \frac{1 - H_i^{-1}}{g\, \ell_i\, \sinh\alpha}\, dt \ . \end{aligned} \tag{6.68}$$

This is precisely the $k = 0$ AdS_7 black hole obtained in the previous section, with the angular momenta reparameterised as $\ell_i = \mu\, g^2\, \sinh^2\beta_i/16$. This establishes that the 2-charge $k = 0$ AdS black hole in $D = 7$ can be reinterpreted as the decoupling limit of the rotating $M2$-brane. (Of course in this example, one can *only* discuss the embedding when the scalar fields are included, since there is no choice of charge parameters for which the scalar fields vanish in the seven-dimensional black holes. This contrasts with the cases of the rotating $D3$-branes and $M5$-branes, where the special choice of setting all the charges equal allows the discussion of a simplified ansatz where the scalars are omitted.)

6.11 Charge as angular momentum

To those students of Kaluza-Klein theory who are used to the idea that electric charge is *momentum* in an extra dimension, it may come as a bit of a shock to learn that the electric charges of the AdS black holes correspond to *angular momenta* in extra dimensions. My understanding of this is as follows and it relies crucially on the interpretation of $AdS_{\tilde{d}+1} \times S^{d+1}$ vacua as the near-horizon limit of $(\tilde{d}-1)$-brane geometries.

Momentum and angular momentum correspond to generators of the Poincaré group or AdS group, and hence to spacetimes that are asymptotically Minkowski or AdS. If the spacetime is asymptotically M^D, for example, it makes sense to talk about angular momentum in D dimensions. On the other hand, if the spacetime is asymptotically $AdS_{\tilde{d}+1} \times S^{d+1}$, it makes sense to talk about angular momentum in $(\tilde{d}+1)$ dimensions but not in $D = (\tilde{d}+d+2)$ dimensions. Of course, there is an $SO(d+2)$ symmetry but this is just the isometry group of S^{d+1}; I see no reason (yet) to call this angular momentum [16].

The ability to call $SO(d+2)$ angular momentum depends crucially on the the fact that the $AdS_{\tilde{d}+1}$ vacua are near horizon geometries of $(\tilde{d}-1)$-branes and that these brane geometries tend asymptotically to $M^{\tilde{d}+d+2}$. We can now legitimately refer to S^{d+1} as the rotation group in the d dimensions transverse to the branes, and if we allow these branes to spin it will describe their angular momentum.

(Having said this, one should probably not refer to the electric charge of ordinary five-dimensional Kaluza-Klein as "momentum in the fifth direction" either. After all, the symmetry group of $M^4 \times S^1$ is $P_4 \times U(1)$ and not P_5.)

6.12 Magnetic black holes

We have seen that the $N = 8$ gauged supergravity naturally admits a four-electric-charge black hole solution. In fact it turns out that this solution is easily generalized to give magnetically charged black holes; although the full theory involves non-abelian $SO(8)$ gauge fields, the $U(1)^4$ truncation of (6.32) gives rise to bosonic equations of motion that are symmetric under the electric-magnetic duality

$$F^i \to X_i^{-2} * F^i, \qquad X_i \to {X_i}^{-1} \tag{6.69}$$

The resulting four magnetic charge solution in the case $k = 1$ has the form

$$ds^2 = -(H_1H_2H_3H_4)^{-1/2} f dt^2 + (H_1H_2H_3H_4)^{1/2}(f^{-1}dr^2 + r^2 d\Omega^2),$$

[16] Somewhat confusingly, some authors refer to the black holes as "spinning in the S^{d+1} directions" but this is, in my opinion, an abuse of language.

$$
\begin{aligned}
&X_i = H_i (H_1 H_2 H_3 H_4)^{-1/4} \\
&H_i = 1 + \frac{\mu \sinh^2 \beta_i}{r}, \qquad f = 1 - \frac{\mu}{r} + 4g^2 r^2 (H_1 H_2 H_3 H_4), \\
&F^i_{\theta\phi} = \mu \cosh \beta_i \sinh \beta_\iota \sin\theta.
\end{aligned} \tag{6.70}
$$

While the extremal limit is once again reached by taking $\mu \to 0$ and $\beta_i \to \infty$ with $P_\alpha \equiv \mu \sinh^2 \beta_i$ fixed, the resulting extremal black hole is in fact not supersymmetric whenever $g \neq 0$! In the case of the magnetic Reissner-Nordström black hole, this phenomenon was previously found in [91]. (Note, however, that it is possible to obtain magnetic black holes that do preserve some supersymmetry if one allows for event horizons with non-spherical topologies [197]) To see that (6.70) admits no Killing spinors, we note that while the scalar potential is symmetric under $X_i \to {X_i}^{-1}$, the scalar related terms in the supersymmetry variations are not. In particular, focusing on $\delta\chi$, we find for example

$$
\begin{aligned}
\delta(2\chi^{(3)i_{(1)}}) \;=\; & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \epsilon^{ij} \gamma^r \Bigg\{ \partial_r \log \frac{H_1 H_3}{H_2 H_4} [\delta^{jk} - i\eta f^{-1/2} \gamma_{\overline{0}} \gamma^5 \epsilon_{jk}] \\
& + \partial_r ((H_1 + H_3) - (H_2 + H_4)) [\sqrt{2} g r f^{-1/2} \gamma_{\overline{r}} \delta^{jk}] \Bigg\} \epsilon_{k_{(1)}}
\end{aligned} \tag{6.71}
$$

(where $\eta \equiv \eta_1 = \eta_2 = \eta_3 = \eta_4$), indicating explicitly that the g-dependent term on the last line has a different structure than the others. This is in contrast to the electric solution. Additionally, note that the matrices $[i\gamma_{\overline{0}}\gamma^5 \epsilon_{ij}]$ and $[\gamma_{\overline{r}} \delta^{ij}]$ now commute, while previously, for the electric black hole, they had anticommuted in the absence of γ^5.

For both of the above reasons, we see that whenever $g \neq 0$ none of the supersymmetry variations vanish, and hence the magnetic solution is non-BPS (regardless of the choice of signs of the magnetic charges). In the $g \to 0$ limit, on the other hand, the last line of (6.71) drops out, and we are left with

$$
\delta(2\chi^{3i_{(1)}}) = \sqrt{2} \epsilon^{ij} \gamma^r \partial_r \log \frac{H_1 H_3}{H_2 H_4} \tilde{P}_\eta \epsilon_{j_{(1)}}, \tag{6.72}
$$

where $\tilde{P}^{ij}_\eta = \frac{1}{2}[\delta^{ij} - i\eta \gamma_{\overline{0}} \gamma^5 \epsilon_{ij}]$ is the projection appropriate to a magnetically charged solution.

Just as for the electrically charged solutions, we may embed the magnetically charged solutions back in eleven dimensions. Although the electrically charged black holes then have the interpretation as the near-horizon limit of a rotating $M2$-brane, we do not have any such simple interpretation in the magnetic case.

6.13 Kaluza-Klein states as black holes

For *ungauged* $N = 8$ supergravity, the supersymmetry algebra admits 4 central charges Z_1, Z_2, Z_3, Z_4. States fall into 5 categories according as they are annihilated by $4 \geq q \geq 0$ supersymmetry generators. q also counts the number of Z's that obey the bound $M = Z_{max}$. Non-rotating black holes (in the sense of vanishing bosonic Kerr angular momentum L) belong to superspin $L = 0$ supermultiplets [192, 166]. Starting with a spin $J = 0$ member, the rest of the black hole multiplet may then be filled out using the fermionic zero-modes [193, 194]. The spin will run from $J = 0$ up to $J = (8 - q)/2$. For *gauged* supergravity, the algebra is different with no central charges but the same multiplet shortening phenomenon still occurs [195, 204]. So we can be confident that the above black holes preserving $4, 2, 1, 0$ supersymmetries will belong to supermultiplets with maximum spins $2, 3, 7/2, 4$ [17]. Unfortunately, as far as we know, the analogue of the $M = Z_{max}$ condition has never been been spelled out in the literature. It is presumably some relation between the AdS quantum numbers (E_0, s) and the $SO(8)$ Casimirs.

It seems entirely consistent, therefore, to identify a subset of the maximum spin 2 black hole supermultiplets with the S^7 Kaluza-Klein spectrum, in analogy with the black hole Kaluza-Klein correspondence of ungauged supergravity [196, 204]. The subset in question will correspond to electric black holes whose mass is quantized in units of the inverse S^7 radius. However, this raises the puzzle of how the black holes carrying only $U(1)$ charges can be identified with the Kaluza-Klein particles carrying non-trivial $SO(8)$ representations. Although we have not demonstrated this explicitly, it seems reasonable to suppose that it is the fermion zero modes that provide the non-trivial $SO(8)$ quantum numbers just as they provide the non-trivial spin. The fact that these nonabelian charges arise from *fermionic hair* also nicely circumvents the usual no-hair theorems of classical relativity. In this connection, it would be interesting to repeat the gyromagnetic ratio calculations of [194] and verify that the fermionic hair again yields a gyromagnetic ratio equal to 1, as demanded by Kaluza-Klein reasoning.

It is furthermore tempting, in analogy with the ungauged case, to identify the 2, 3 and 4 charge solutions as 2, 3 and 4-particle bound states of the singly charged solution [166, 198]. However, although the quantum number assignments are consistent with this, we do not have multi-center solutions in the AdS case. Such a bound state interpretation would, of course, lead to states of arbitrarily high spin.

[17] The maximum spin 5/2 solutions are (mysteriously?) absent just as for ungauged supergravity.

Another difference between the S^7 and the T^7 compactifications is that the $g \to 0$ limit of the gauged supergravity does not directly coincide with the massless sector of the T^7 compactification. They differ by various dualizations. Thus it was possible, for example, to find 4-charge solutions with all charges electric as opposed to the 2-electric and 2-magnetic charges of the ungauged theory. Moreover, whereas 2 charges are Kaluza-Klein modes and 2 are winding modes in the Type IIA string theory context, there is no T or U-duality associated with the S^7 compactification.

One might also generalize the purely electric and purely magnetic solutions discussed here to dyonic black hole solutions of gauged $N = 8$ supergravity. Neither magnetic nor dyonic black holes have any Kaluza-Klein interpretation and do not appear in the spectrum of the S^7 compactification of $D = 11$ supergravity. It would be interesting to provide their M-theory interpretation and to determine their role in the AdS/CFT correspondence.

6.14 Recent Developments

Since these lectures were delivered, several papers have appeared on related topics:

* Explicit Kaluza-Klein ansätze for deriving various gauged supergravites have recently been given: $N = 4$, $D = 7$ gauged supergravity from $D = 11$ supergravity [223, 224]; $N = 1$, $D = 7$ gauged supergravity from $D = 11$ supergravity [225]; $N = 4$, $SU(2) \times U(1)$, $D = 5$ gauged supergravity from $D = 10$ Type IIB supergravity [226]; $N = 4$, $SO(4)$, $D = 4$ gauged supergravity from $D = 11$ supergravity [227]. The complete ansatz for $N = 8$, $SO(6)$, $D = 5$ gauged supergravity from $D = 10$ Type IIB supergravity remains unsolved.

* The CFT duals of AdS black holes rotating in spacetime and carrying electric charge as a consequence of the rotation of the corresponding branes in the transverse dimensions, as discussed in Section 6, are treated in [228] and [245]. These papers also exploit the appearance of the $N = 8$ superconformal singleton action [39] as the membrane on the boundary, discussed in Section 5.

* The thermodynamics of spinning branes and their field theory duals are discussed in [247], while the phase structure of non-commutative field theories and spinning brane bound states are discussed in [248].

* Unitary supermultiplets of $Osp(6, 2|4)$, discussed in Section 5, and the AdS_7/CFT_6 correspondence are treated in [229].

* An application of the correspondence between AdS_4 and a $d = 3$ conformal field theory involving the squashed S^7 [69, 20] discussed in Section 2.2 is given in [244].

* The *Membrane at the End of the Universe* finds application in [240], which resolves

some puzzles in the AdS/CFT correspondence.

* A review of M-theory cosmology may be found in [241].

6.15 Problems 6

1. Calculate the Ricci tensor for the general Kaluza-Klein ansatz for odd sphere S^{2k-1} reductions of the D-dimensional metric.

2. Compute the near-horizon limit of the rotating p-brane carrying a single charge given in 7.5.

7 SOLUTIONS TO PROBLEMS

7.1 Solutions 1

1. In fact we will solve a slightly more general problem by starting with the D-dimensional Einstein action

$$I_D = \frac{1}{2{\kappa_D}^2}\int d^D x\sqrt{-\hat{g}}\hat{R} \tag{7.1}$$

which after integration by parts may be written

$$I_D = \frac{1}{2{\kappa_D}^2}\int d^D x\sqrt{-\hat{g}}(\Omega_{ABC}\Omega^{ABC} - 2\Omega_{ABC}\Omega^{CAB} - 4\Omega_{CA}{}^{A}\Omega^{C}{}_{B}{}^{B}) \tag{7.2}$$

where Ω_{MNP} are the anholonomy coefficients A.14. We write the vielbein as

$$e_M{}^A = \begin{pmatrix} e_\mu{}^\alpha & e_\mu{}^a \\ e_m{}^\alpha & e_m{}^a \end{pmatrix} \tag{7.3}$$

so that the metric takes the form

$$\hat{g}_{\hat{\mu}\hat{\nu}} = \begin{pmatrix} g_{\mu\nu} + g_{mn}A_\mu{}^m A_\nu{}^n & g_{mn}A_\mu{}^m \\ g_{mn}A_\nu{}^n & g_{mn} \end{pmatrix} \tag{7.4}$$

where

$$A_\mu{}^m = e^m{}_a e_\mu{}^a \tag{7.5}$$

Note that

$$det\ g_{MN} = det\ g_{\mu\nu} det\ g_{mn} \equiv det\ g_{\mu\nu}\Delta \tag{7.6}$$

If we choose a gauge $e_m{}^\alpha = 0$, the only non-vanishing components are $\Omega_{\alpha\beta\gamma}$,

$$\Omega_{\beta\alpha c} = e_{mc}e^\mu{}_\alpha e^\nu{}_\beta F_{\mu\nu}{}^m$$

$$\Omega_{\alpha bc} = -\Omega_{b\alpha c} = -e^m{}_b e^\mu{}_\alpha \partial_\mu e_{mc} \tag{7.7}$$

where

$$F_{\mu\nu}{}^{m} = \partial_\mu A_\nu{}^{m} - \partial_\nu A_\mu{}^{m} \tag{7.8}$$

Here we have assumed that all fields are independent of the extra coordinates y^m. This yields the four-dimensional action

$$I_4 = \frac{1}{2{\kappa_4}^2}\int d^4x\sqrt{-g}\sqrt{\Delta}[R - \frac{1}{4}g_{ij}F_{\mu\nu}{}^{i}F_{\rho\sigma}{}^{j}g^{\mu\rho}g^{\nu\sigma} + \frac{1}{4}g^{\rho\sigma}(g^{ik}g^{jl} - g^{il}g^{jk})\partial_\rho g_{ik}\partial_\sigma g_{jl}] \tag{7.9}$$

We can eliminate $\sqrt{\Delta}$ by a Weyl rescaling

$$e_\mu{}^{a} \to \Delta^{1/4}e_\mu{}^{a} \tag{7.10}$$

to obtain

$$I_4 = \frac{1}{2{\kappa_4}^2}\int d^4x\sqrt{-g}[R - \frac{1}{4}\sqrt{\Delta}g_{ij}F_{\mu\nu}{}^{i}F_{\rho\sigma}{}^{j}g^{\mu\rho}g^{\nu\sigma} + \frac{1}{4}g^{\mu\nu}\partial_\mu g_{ij}\partial_\nu g^{ij} - \frac{1}{8}g^{\mu\nu}\partial_\mu ln\Delta\partial_\nu ln\Delta] \tag{7.11}$$

In the special case of one extra dimension, $g_{11} = e^{-\sqrt{3}\phi}$, $\Delta = e^{-\phi/\sqrt{3}}$, we obtain the required result.

Note that, of the original D-dimensional diffeomorphism group with parameters $\xi^M(x,y)$, the surviving symmetry is the 4-dimensional diffeomorphism group with parameters $\xi^\mu(x)$, an abelian $U(1)^k$ gauge invariance with parameter $\xi^m(x)$ and a global $SL(n,R)$ invariance with constant parameter $a^m{}_n$ with $a^m{}_m = 0$:

$$\xi^\mu = \xi^\mu(x)$$

$$\xi^m = \xi^m(x) + a^m{}_n y^n \tag{7.12}$$

The choice of gauge $e_m{}^\alpha = 0$ does not restrict these invariances, since

$$\delta e_m{}^\alpha = \xi^\mu\partial_\mu e_m{}^\alpha + a_m{}^n e_n{}^\alpha = 0 \tag{7.13}$$

2. We make a $4+7$ split of the world indices:

$$x^M = (x^\mu, y^m) \tag{7.14}$$

where $\mu = 0,1,2,3$ and $m = 4,5,6,7,8,9,10$ and write the $SO(1,10)$ spinor index as

$$\alpha = (\alpha', \alpha'') \tag{7.15}$$

where $\alpha' = 1,\ldots 4$ is a spinor index of $SO(1,3)$ and $\alpha'' = 1,\ldots 8$ is a spinor index of $SO(7)$. Then the fields split according to the T^7 column of Table 8.

$D=11$	$D=4$	field	spin	T^7	S^7
g_{MN}	$g_{\mu\nu}$	tensor	2	1	1
	$g_{\mu n}$	vectors	1	7	28
	g_{mn}	scalars	0	28	35
$\Psi_M{}^{\alpha}$	$\Psi_\mu{}^{\alpha'\alpha''}$	vector-spinors	3/2	8	8
	$\Psi_m{}^{\alpha'\alpha''}$	spinors	1/2	56	56
A_{MNP}	$A_{\mu\nu\rho}$	3-form	–	1	0
	$A_{\mu\nu p}$	2-forms	0	7	0
	$A_{\mu np}$	1-forms	1	21	0
	A_{mnp}	0-forms	0	35	35

Table 8: The fields of $(D=4, N=8)$ supergravity coming from $D=11, N=1$ on T^7 and S^7

The spin assigments are obvious except for the 3-form and 2-form gauge fields. A 3-form is dual to a non-propagating auxilary field c:

$$\sqrt{-g}g^{\mu\alpha}g^{\nu\beta}g^{\rho\gamma}g^{\sigma\delta}\partial_\alpha A_{\beta\gamma\delta} = \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}c \tag{7.16}$$

and $c = constant$ as a result of the Bianchi identity $ddA \equiv 0$. Similarly, a 2-form gauge field is dual to a scalar field ϕ:

$$\sqrt{-g}g^{\mu\alpha}g^{\nu\beta}g^{\rho\gamma}\partial_\alpha A_{\beta\gamma} = \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}\partial_\sigma\phi \tag{7.17}$$

and $\partial^2\phi = 0$ as a result of the Bianchi identity.

To summarize: the particle content of $N=8, D=4$ supergravity is (1 spin 2, 8 spin 3/2, 28 spin 1, 56 spin 1/2, 70 spin zero).

7.2 Solutions 2

1. The Einstein equation follows from varying with respect to g_{MN} and the 3-form equation follows by varying with respect to A_{MNP}. We shall need the identities:

$$\delta(\sqrt{-g}g^{MN}R_{MN}) = (\delta\sqrt{-g})g^{MN}R_{MN} + \sqrt{-g}(\delta g^{MN})R_{MN}\sqrt{-g}g^{MN}(\delta R_{MN}) \tag{7.18}$$

and

$$\delta\sqrt{-g} = \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{-g}g^{MN}\delta g_{MN} \tag{7.19}$$

$$\delta g^{MN} = -g^{MP}g^{NQ}\delta g_{PQ} \tag{7.20}$$

$$\sqrt{-g}g^{MN}\delta R_{MN} = \partial_N(\sqrt{-g}g^{MN}\delta\Gamma_{ML}{}^{L}) - \partial_L(\sqrt{-g}g^{MN}\delta\Gamma_{MN}{}^{L}) \tag{7.21}$$

Since the last expression is a total divergence we can drop the final term in (7.18). Similarly

$$\delta(\sqrt{-g}g^{MR}g^{NS}g^{PT}g^{QU}F_{MNPQ}F_{RSTU}) = \sqrt{-g}(4F_M{}^{PQR}F_{NPQR} - \frac{1}{2}g_{MN}F^{PQRS}F_{PQRS}) \tag{7.22}$$

Bearing in mind that the AFF term is independent of the metric, we obtain the Einstein equation (2.1).

A straightforward variation of the action with respect to A_{MNP} then yields the 3-form equation (2.34).

2. We begin by making an ansatz for the $D = 11$ gauge fields $g_{MN} = e_M{}^A e_N{}^B \eta_{AB}$ and A_{MNP} corresponding to the most general six-five split invariant under $P_6 \times SO(5)$, where P_6 is the $D = 6$ Poincaré group. We split the $D = 11$ coordinates

$$x^M = (x^\mu, y^m) \tag{7.23}$$

where $\mu = 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5$ and $m = 6, 7, 8, 9, 10$, and write the line element as

$$ds^2 = e^{2A}\eta_{\mu\nu}dx^\mu dx^\nu + e^{2B}\delta_{mn}dx^m dx^n \tag{7.24}$$

and the 4-form gauge field strength as

$$F_{mnpq} = \epsilon_{mnpqr}\partial^r e^C \tag{7.25}$$

All other components of F_{MNPQ} and all components of the gravitino Ψ_M are set equal to zero. P_6 invariance requires that the arbitrary functions A, B and C depend only on y^m; $SO(5)$ invariance then requires that this dependence be only through $y = \sqrt{\delta_{mn}y^m y^n}$.

As we shall show, the three arbitrary functions A, B, and C are reduced to one by the requirement that the field configuration (7.24) and (7.25) preserve some unbroken supersymmetry. In other words, there must exist Killing spinors ϵ satisfying

$$\tilde{D}_M\epsilon = 0 \tag{7.26}$$

where $\tilde{D}_M$ is the bosonic part of the supercovariant derivative appearing in the supersymmetry transformation rule of the gravitino (A.18).

We make the six-five split

$$\Gamma^A = (\gamma_\alpha \otimes \mathbf{1}, \gamma_7 \otimes \Sigma_a) \tag{7.27}$$

where γ_α and Σ_a are the $D = 6$ and $D = 5$ Dirac matrices respectively and where

$$\gamma_7 = \gamma_0 \cdots \gamma_5 \tag{7.28}$$

so that ${\gamma_7}^2 = 1$. We also decompose the spinor field as

$$\epsilon(x, y) = \zeta(x) \otimes \eta(y) \tag{7.29}$$

where ζ is a constant spinor of $SO(1, 5)$ which may further be decomposed into chiral eigenstates via the projection operators $(1 \pm \gamma_7)/2$ and η is an $SO(5)$ spinor .

In our background (7.24) and (7.25), the supercovariant derivative becomes:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{D}_\mu &= \partial_\mu - \frac{1}{2}\gamma^\mu\gamma_7\Sigma^m\partial_m e^{2A} - \frac{1}{12}\gamma_\mu\Sigma^m\partial_m e^C, \\ \tilde{D}_m &= \partial_m + \frac{1}{2}\Sigma_m\Sigma^n\partial_n e^B - \frac{1}{6}\partial_m e^C\gamma_7 - \frac{1}{6}(\Sigma_m\Sigma^n - \Sigma_n\Sigma^m)\partial_m e^C \end{aligned} \tag{7.30}$$

Hence we find that (2.35) admits non-trivial solutions

$$(1 + \gamma_7)\eta = 0 \tag{7.31}$$

where

$$\eta = e^{-C/6}\eta_0 \tag{7.32}$$

where η_0 is a constant spinor and

$$\begin{aligned} A &= \frac{1}{3}C \\ B &= -\frac{2}{3}C + constant \end{aligned} \tag{7.33}$$

In each case, (7.31) means that one half of the maximal possible supersymmetry survives.

With the substitutions (7.24), (7.25) and (7.33), the Einstein equation and the 4-form equation reduce to the single equation for one unknown:

$$\delta^{mn}\partial_m\partial_n e^{-C} = 0 \tag{7.34}$$

and hence, imposing the boundary condition that the metric be asymptotically Minkowskian, we find

$$e^{-C} = 1 + \frac{b^3}{y^3} \tag{7.35}$$

where k_6 is a constant, at this stage arbitrary. Thus the metric is given by

$$ds^2 = (1 + b^3/y^3)^{-1/3} dx^\mu dx_\mu + (1 + b^3/y^3)^{2/3}(dy^2 + y^2 d\Omega_4{}^2) \tag{7.36}$$

and the four-form field strength by

$$F_4 = 3b^3 \epsilon_4 \tag{7.37}$$

Here ϵ_4 is the volume form on S^4 and Ω_4 is the volume.

7.3 Solutions 3

1. We use the duality between M-theory compactified on a 2-torus T^2 of area A (measured with the M theory metric g^M) and the Type IIB theory compactified on a circle S^1 of radius R (measured with the IIB metric $g^B = \beta^2 g^M$) [101]. Thus p-brane tensions of dimension $d = p + 1$ will be related to each other by $T_d^M = \beta^d T_d{}^B$.

   The $D = 9$ particle spectrum will involve Kaluza-Klein $M0$-branes of mass $T_I^M(KK) = 2\pi A^{-1/2}$ which are identified with winding states of mass $T_1^B(W) = 2\pi R T_2^B$, coming from wrapping the IIB string with tension T_2^B around S^1, so

   $$2\pi A^{-1/2} = \beta 2\pi R T_2^B \tag{7.38}$$

   There will also be winding $M0$-branes of mass AT_3^M coming from wrapping the $M2$-brane with tension T_3^Maround T^2, which are identified with the IIB Kaluza-Klein states of mass R^{-1}, so

   $$AT_3{}^M = \beta R^{-1} \tag{7.39}$$

   Hence

   $$A = \beta^4 \left(\frac{T_2{}^B}{T_3{}^M} \right)^2 \tag{7.40}$$

   and

   $$R = \beta^{-3} \frac{T_3{}^M}{(T_2{}^B)^2} \tag{7.41}$$

   Next we identify the $M2$-brane in $D = 9$ with the $D3$-brane with tension $T_4{}^B$ wrapped around S^1:

   $$T_3^M = \beta^3 2\pi R T_4{}^B \tag{7.42}$$

and the $D3$-brane in $D = 9$ with the $M5$-brane with tension T_6^M wrapped around T^2:

$$AT_6{}^M = \beta^4 T_4{}^B \tag{7.43}$$

Eliminating R we find

$$T_4{}^B = \frac{1}{2\pi}(T_2{}^B)^2 \tag{7.44}$$

and eliminating A we find

$$\frac{T_6{}^M}{(T_3{}^M)^2} = \frac{T_4{}^B}{(T_2{}^B)^2} \tag{7.45}$$

and hence that

$$T_6{}^M = \frac{1}{2\pi}(T_3{}^M)^2 \tag{7.46}$$

in agreement with the purely $D = 11$ result (2.71).

2. The Lagrangian of $D = 9$ $N = 2$ supergravity as low-energy limit of Type IIA string compactified on a circle can be obtained from dimensional reduction of Type IIA supergravity in $D = 10$, which itself can be obtained from dimensional reduction of $D = 11$ supergravity. Using the notation adopted in [168], the bosonic sector of the theory contains the vielbeins, a dilaton ϕ together with a second dilatonic scalar φ (which measures the size of the compactifying circle), one 4-form field strength $\tilde{F}_4 = dA_3$, two 3-forms $\tilde{F}_3^{(i)} = dA_2^{(i)}$, three 2-forms $\tilde{F}_2^{(12)} = dA_1^{(12)}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_2^{(i)} = d\mathcal{A}_1^{(i)}$ and one 1-form $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_1^{(12)} = d\mathcal{A}_0^{(12)}$. The full bosonic Lagrangian is given by

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-1}\mathcal{L}_{\rm IIA} &= R - \tfrac{1}{2}(\partial\phi)^2 - \tfrac{1}{2}(\partial\varphi)^2 - \tfrac{1}{2}(\mathcal{F}_1^{(12)})^2 e^{-\frac{3}{2}\phi - \frac{\sqrt{7}}{2}\varphi} \\ &\quad - \tfrac{1}{48}(F_4)^2 e^{-\frac{1}{2}\phi - \frac{3}{2\sqrt{7}}\varphi} - \tfrac{1}{12}(F_3^{(1)})^2 e^{\phi - \frac{1}{\sqrt{7}}\varphi} - \tfrac{1}{12}(F_3^{(2)})^2 e^{-\frac{1}{2}\phi + \frac{5}{2\sqrt{7}}\varphi} \\ &\quad - \tfrac{1}{4}(F_2^{(12)})^2 e^{\phi + \frac{3}{\sqrt{7}}\varphi} - \tfrac{1}{4}(\mathcal{F}_2^{(1)})^2 e^{-\frac{3}{2}\phi - \frac{1}{2\sqrt{7}}\varphi} - \tfrac{1}{4}(\mathcal{F}_2^{(2)})^2 e^{-\frac{4}{\sqrt{7}}\varphi} \\ &\quad - \tfrac{1}{2}\tilde{F}_4 \wedge \tilde{F}_4 \wedge A_1^{(12)} - \tilde{F}_3^{(1)} \wedge \tilde{F}_3^{(2)} \wedge A_3 \ . \end{aligned} \tag{7.47}$$

Here we are using the notation that field strengths without tildes include the various Chern-Simon modifications, whilst field strengths written with tildes do not include the mofications. Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} F_4 &= \tilde{F}_4 - \tilde{F}_3^{(1)} \wedge \mathcal{A}_1^{(1)} - \tilde{F}_3^{(2)} \wedge \mathcal{A}_1^{(2)} - \tfrac{1}{2}\tilde{F}_2^{(12)} \wedge \mathcal{A}_1^{(1)} \wedge \mathcal{A}_1^{(2)} \ , \\ F_3^{(1)} &= \tilde{F}_3^{(1)} - \tilde{F}_2^{(12)} \wedge \mathcal{A}_1^{(2)} \ , \\ F_3^{(2)} &= \tilde{F}_3^{(2)} + F_2^{(12)} \wedge \mathcal{A}_1^{(1)} - \mathcal{A}_0^{(12)}(\tilde{F}_3^{(1)} - F_2^{(12)} \wedge \mathcal{A}_1^{(2)}) \ , \\ F_2^{(12)} &= \tilde{F}_2^{(12)} \ , \qquad \mathcal{F}_2^{(1)} = \mathcal{F}_2^{(1)} + \mathcal{A}_0^{(12)}\mathcal{F}_1^{(2)} \ , \quad \mathcal{F}_2^{(2)} = \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_2^{(2)} \ , \quad \mathcal{F}_1^{(12)} = \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_1^{(12)} \ . \end{aligned} \tag{7.48}$$

	IIA			IIB	
	$D=10$	$D=9$	T-duality	$D=9$	$D=10$
R-R fields	A_3	A_3	$\longleftrightarrow$	A_3	B_4
		$A_2^{(1)}$	$\longleftrightarrow$	$A_2^{\rm R}$	$A_2^{\rm R}$
	$\mathcal{A}_1^{(1)}$	$\mathcal{A}_1^{(1)}$	$\longleftrightarrow$	$A_1^{\rm R}$	
		$\mathcal{A}_0^{(12)}$	$\longleftrightarrow$	χ	χ
NS-NS fields	$G_{\mu\nu}$	$\mathcal{A}_1^{(2)}$	$\longleftrightarrow$	$A_1^{\rm NS}$	$A_2^{\rm NS}$
	$A_2^{(1)}$	$A_2^{(1)}$	$\longleftrightarrow$	$A_2^{\rm NS}$	
		$A_1^{(12)}$	$\longleftrightarrow$	$\mathcal{A}_1$	$G_{\mu\nu}$

Table 9: Gauge potentials of Type II theories in $D=10$ and $D=9$

The lagrangian of the $D=9$ supergravity as low-energy limit of Type IIB string compactified on a circle can be obtained from dimensional reduction of Type IIB supergravity in $D=10$. It is given by

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-1}\mathcal{L}_{\rm IIB} &= R - \tfrac{1}{2}(\partial\phi)^2 - \tfrac{1}{2}(\partial\varphi)^2 - \tfrac{1}{2}e^{-2\phi}(\partial\chi)^2 \\ &\quad -\tfrac{1}{48}e^{\frac{2}{\sqrt{7}}\varphi}F_4^2 - \tfrac{1}{12}e^{\phi-\frac{1}{\sqrt{7}}\varphi}(F_3^{(\rm NS)})^2 - \tfrac{1}{2}e^{-\phi-\frac{1}{\sqrt{7}}\varphi}(F_3^{(\rm R)})^2 \\ &\quad -\tfrac{1}{4}e^{-\frac{4}{\sqrt{7}}\varphi}(\mathcal{F}_2)^2 - \tfrac{1}{4}e^{-\phi+\frac{3}{\sqrt{7}}\varphi}(F_2^{(\rm R)})^2 - \tfrac{1}{4}e^{\phi+\frac{3}{\sqrt{7}}\varphi}(F_2^{(\rm NS)})^2 \\ &\quad -\tfrac{1}{2}\tilde{F}_4\wedge\tilde{F}_4\wedge\mathcal{A}_1 - \tilde{F}_3^{(\rm NS)}\wedge\tilde{F}_3^{(\rm R)}\wedge A_3 \ . \end{aligned} \tag{7.49}$$

Note that in $D=10$, there are two 2-form antisymmetric tensors, one of which is the NS-NS field $A_2^{(\rm NS)}$, and the other is the R-R field $A_2^{(\rm R)}$. The dimensional reduction of these two 2-form guage potentials also gives rise to two vector fields in $D=9$, denoted by $A_1^{(\rm NS)}$ and $A_1^{(\rm R)}$ respectively.

The $D=10$ IIA string and IIB string are related by by a perturbative T-duality, in that Type IIA string compactified on a circle with radius R is equivalent to Type IIB string compactified on a circle with radius $1/R$. At the level of their low-energy effective actions, it implies that there is only one $D=9$ $N=2$ supergravity. The Lagrangians (7.47) and (7.49) are related to each other [86] by local field redefinitions. The relations between the gauge potentials of these two nine-dimensional theories (including the axions) are summarized in Table 9.

The relation between the dilatonic scalars of the two nine-dimensional theories is given by

$$\begin{pmatrix} \phi \\ \varphi \end{pmatrix}_{IIA} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{3}{4} & -\frac{\sqrt{7}}{4} \\ -\frac{\sqrt{7}}{4} & -\frac{3}{4} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \phi \\ \varphi \end{pmatrix}_{IIB} . \tag{7.50}$$

The dimensional reduction of the ten-dimensional string metric to $D = 9$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} ds^2_{\rm str} &= e^{-\frac{1}{2}\phi}\, ds^2_{10} \\ &= e^{-\frac{1}{2}\phi}\, (e^{\varphi/(2\sqrt{7})}\, ds^2_9 + e^{-\sqrt{7}\varphi/2}\, (dz_2 + \mathcal{A})^2) , \end{aligned} \tag{7.51}$$

where ds^2_{10} and ds^2_9 are the Einstein-frame metrics in $D = 10$ and $D = 9$. The radius of the compactifying circle, measured using the ten-dimensional string metric, is therefore given by $R = e^{-\frac{1}{4}\phi - \sqrt{7}\varphi/4}$. It follows from (7.50) that the radii R_{IIA} and R_{IIB} of the compactifying circles, measured using their respective ten-dimensional string metrics, are related by $R_{IIA} = 1/R_{IIB}$.

7.4 Solutions 4

1. We begin with the bosonic sector of the $d = 3$ worldvolume of the $D = 11$ supermembrane 4.1. To see how a double worldvolume/spacetime compactification of the $D = 11$ supermembrane theory on S^1 leads to the Type IIA string in $D = 10$, let us denote all $(d = 3, D = 11)$ quantities by a hat and all $(d = 2, D = 10)$ quantities without. We then make a ten-one split of the spacetime coordinates

$$\hat{x}^{\hat{M}} = (x^M, y) \qquad M = 0, 1, \ldots, 9 \tag{7.52}$$

and a two-one split of the worldvolume coordinates

$$\hat{\xi}^{\hat{i}} = (\xi^i, \xi^2) \qquad i = 0, 1 \tag{7.53}$$

in order to make the partial gauge choice

$$\xi^2 = y, \tag{7.54}$$

which identifies the eleventh dimension of spacetime with the third dimension of the worldvolume. The dimensional reduction is then effected by taking the background fields $\hat{g}_{\hat{M}\hat{N}}$ and $\hat{A}_{\hat{M}\hat{N}\hat{P}}$ to be independent of y. The string backgrounds of dilaton ϕ, string σ-model metric g_{MN}, 1-form A_M, 2-form B_{MN} and 3-form A_{MNP} are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{g}_{MN} &= e^{-2\phi/3} \begin{pmatrix} g_{MN} + e^{\Phi} A_M A_N & e^{2\phi} A_M \\ e^{2\phi} A_N & e^{\Phi} \end{pmatrix} \\ \hat{A}_{MNP} &= A_{MNP} \\ \hat{A}_{MNY} &= A_{MN} . \end{aligned} \tag{7.55}$$

The choice of dilaton prefactor, $e^{-2\phi/3}$, is dictated by the requirement that g_{MN} be the $D = 10$ string σ-model metric. (To obtain the $D = 10$ fivebrane σ-model metric, the prefactor is unity because the reduction is then spacetime only and not simultaneous worldvolume/spacetime. This explains the remarkable "coincidence" between $\hat{g}_{MN}$ and the $D = 10$ fivebrane σ-model metric.)

Varying the supermembrane action (4.1) with respect to the metric $\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{i}\hat{j}}$ yields the embedding equation

$$\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{i}\hat{j}} = \partial_{\hat{i}}\hat{x}^{\hat{M}}\partial_{\hat{j}}\hat{x}^{\hat{N}}\hat{g}_{\hat{M}\hat{N}}(\hat{x}) \tag{7.56}$$

while varying with respect to $\hat{x}^{\hat{M}}$ yields the equation of motion

$$\partial_{\hat{i}}(\sqrt{-\hat{\gamma}}\hat{\gamma}^{\hat{i}\hat{j}}\partial_{\hat{j}}\hat{x}^{\hat{M}}) + \sqrt{-\hat{\gamma}}\hat{\gamma}^{\hat{i}\hat{j}}\partial_{\hat{i}}\hat{x}^{\hat{N}}\partial_{\hat{j}}\hat{x}^{\hat{P}}\hat{\Gamma}_{\hat{N}\hat{P}}{}^{\hat{M}} = \frac{1}{6}\epsilon^{\hat{i}\hat{j}\hat{k}}\partial_{\hat{i}}\hat{x}^{\hat{N}}\partial_{\hat{j}}\hat{x}^{\hat{P}}\partial_{\hat{k}}\hat{x}^{\hat{Q}}\hat{F}^{\hat{M}}{}_{\hat{N}\hat{P}\hat{Q}} \tag{7.57}$$

where $\hat{F}_{\hat{M}\hat{N}\hat{P}\hat{Q}}$ is the field strength of $\hat{A}_{\hat{M}\hat{N}\hat{P}}$,

$$\hat{F}_{\hat{M}\hat{N}\hat{P}\hat{Q}} = 4\partial_{[\hat{M}}\hat{A}_{\hat{N}\hat{P}\hat{Q}]} \tag{7.58}$$

Having made the two-one split of the worldvolume coordinates and the ten-one split of the spacetime coordinates, and having made the partial gauge choice, the double dimensional reduction is then effected by demanding that

$$\frac{\partial x^M}{\partial \xi^2} = 0 \tag{7.59}$$

and

$$\frac{\partial \hat{g}_{\hat{M}\hat{N}}}{\partial y} = 0 = \frac{\partial \hat{A}_{\hat{M}\hat{N}\hat{P}}}{\partial y} = 0 \tag{7.60}$$

From (7.55), the induced metric on the worldvolume is now given by

$$\hat{\gamma}_{\hat{i}\hat{j}} \;=\; e^{-2\phi/3}\begin{pmatrix} \gamma_{ij} + e^2\phi A_i A_j & e^{2\phi}A_i \\ e^{2\phi}A_j & e^{2\phi} \end{pmatrix} \tag{7.61}$$

where

$$\gamma_{ij} = \partial_i x^M \partial_j x^N g_{MN}$$
$$A_i = \partial_i x^M A_M \tag{7.62}$$

Note that

$$\sqrt{-\hat{\gamma}} = \sqrt{-\gamma} \tag{7.63}$$

Substituting these expressions into the field equations (7.57) yields in the case $\hat{M} = M$

$$\partial_i(\sqrt{-\gamma}\gamma^{ij}\partial_j x^M) + \sqrt{-\gamma}\gamma^{ij}\partial_i x^N \partial_j x^P \Gamma_{NP}{}^M = \frac{1}{2}\epsilon^{ij}\partial_i x^N \partial_j x^P F^M{}_{NP} \tag{7.64}$$

where F_{MNP} is the field strength of A_{MNP},

$$F_{MNP} = 3\partial_{[M} A_{NP]} \tag{7.65}$$

In the case $\hat{M} = y$, (7.57) is an identity as it must be for consistency.

But (7.64) is just the ten-dimensional string equation of motion derivable from the action

$$\begin{aligned} S_2 = T_2 \int d^2\xi \Big[& - \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{-\gamma}\gamma^{ij}\partial_i x^M \partial_j x^N g_{MN}(x) \\ & - \frac{1}{2!}\epsilon^{ij}\partial_i x^M \partial_j x^N A_{MN}(x)\Big] \end{aligned} \tag{7.66}$$

One may repeat the procedure in superspace to obtain

$$S_2 = T_2 \int d^2\xi \Big[-\frac{1}{2}\sqrt{-\gamma}\gamma^{ij} E_i{}^a E_j{}^b \eta_{ab} + \frac{1}{2!}\epsilon^{ij}\partial_i X^M \partial_j X^N A_{MN}(Z)\Big] \tag{7.67}$$

which is just the action of the Type IIA superstring. Note that the ten-dimensional bosonic R-R fields A_{MNP}, A_M and have decoupled in (7.66). They have not disappeared from the theory, however, since their coupling still survives in the R-R sector of (7.67).

7.5 Solutions 5

1. Rotating p-branes in arbitrary dimensions, supported by a single $(p+2)$-form charge, are all straightforwardly obtained by diagonally oxidising the rotating black holes constructed in [172]. There are two cases arising, depending on whether $\tilde{d}$ is even or odd.

   In this case $\tilde{d} + 2 = 2N$, there are N angular momenta ℓ_i, with $i = 1, 2, \ldots, N$. We find that the metric of the rotating $(n-2)$-brane solution to the equations is

$$\begin{aligned} ds_D^2 = & H^{-\frac{\tilde{d}}{D-2}}\Big(-(1 - \frac{2m}{r^{\tilde{d}}\Delta})\, dt^2 + d\vec{x}\cdot d\vec{x}\Big) + H^{\frac{d}{D-2}}\Big[\frac{\Delta\, dr^2}{H_1\cdots H_N - 2m\, r^{-\tilde{d}}} \\ & + r^2 \sum_{i=1}^N H_i(d\mu_i^2 + \mu_i^2\, d\phi_i^2) - \frac{4m\cosh\beta}{r^{\tilde{d}}\, H\, \Delta}\, dt\, (\sum_{i=1}^N \ell_i\, \mu_i^2\, d\phi_i) \\ & + \frac{2m}{r^{\tilde{d}}\, H\, \Delta}\, (\sum_{i=1}^N \ell_i\, \mu_i^2\, d\phi_i)^2\Big]\,, \end{aligned} \tag{7.68}$$

   where the functions Δ, H and H_i are given by

$$\begin{aligned} & \Delta = H_1\cdots H_N \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\mu_i^2}{H_i}\,, \qquad H = 1 + \frac{2m\, \sinh^2\beta}{r^{\tilde{d}}\,\Delta}\,, \\ & H_i = 1 + \frac{\ell_i^2}{r^2}\,, \qquad i = 1, 2, \ldots, N\,. \end{aligned} \tag{7.69}$$

The dilaton ϕ and gauge potential $A_{(n-1)}$ are given by

$$e^{2\phi/a} = H \ , \qquad A_{(n-1)} = \frac{1 - H^{-1}}{\sinh\beta}\Big(\cosh\beta\, dt + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \ell_i\, \mu_i^2\, d\phi_i\Big) \wedge d^{n-2}x \ . \tag{7.70}$$

The N quantities μ_i, as usual, are subject to the constraint $\sum_i \mu_i^2 = 1$. One can parameterise the μ_i in terms of $(N-1)$ unconstrained angles. A common choice is

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_i &= \sin\psi_i \prod_{j=1}^{i-1} \cos\psi_j \ , \qquad i \le N-1 \ , \\ \mu_N &= \prod_{j=1}^{N-1} \cos\psi_j \ . \end{aligned} \tag{7.71}$$

Note that $\prod_{j=1}^{n} \cos\psi_j$ is defined to be equal to 1 if $n \le 0$.

In the case $\tilde{d} + 2 = 2N + 1$, the solution has the same form as above, but with the range of the index i extended to include 0. However, there is no angular momentum parameter or azimuthal coordinate associated with the extra index value, and so $\ell_0 = 0$ and $\phi_0 = 0$. Otherwise, all the formulae given above are generalised simply by extending the summation to span the range $0 \le i \le N$. Of course $H_0 = 1$ as a consequence of $\ell_0 = 0$.

7.6 Solutions 6

1. The general Kaluza-Klein ansatz for odd sphere S^{2k-1} reductions of the D-dimensional metric may be expressed in the form

$$ds_D^2 = \widetilde{\Delta}^a\, ds_d^2 + \widetilde{\Delta}^{-b} \sum_{i=1}^{k} X_i^{-1} \left(d\mu_i^2 + \mu_i^2\, (d\phi_i + A_{(1)}^i)^2\right) \ , \tag{7.72}$$

where we have set the radius of S^{2k-1} to unity. There are $k-1$ scalar degrees of freedom parameterised by the k quantities X_i satisfying the constraint $\prod_{i=1}^{k} X_i = 1$. This form of the line element encompasses both the S^5 reduction of Type IIB supergravity and the S^7 reduction of eleven dimensional supergravity. As defined previously, $\widetilde{\Delta} = \sum_{i=1}^{k} X_i \mu_i^2$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{k} \mu_i^2 = 1$.

In the absence of the gauge fields, this metric has a block diagonal form, with the blocks corresponding to the d-dimensional spacetime, the $k-1$ direction cosines μ_i and the k azimuthal rotation angles ϕ_i. The main difficulty in computing the curvature of (7.72) lies in the fact that the μ_i's are constrained. Nevertheless, we may perform an asymmetric choice of using the first $k-1$ of them as actual coordinates, while expressing μ_k as the constrained quantity $\mu_k = (1 - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \mu_i^2)^{1/2}$.

Since numerous terms are involved in the computation, it is imperative to clarify our notation. We denote the lower-dimensional spacetime indices by $\mu, \nu, \ldots = 0, 1, \ldots, d-1$, the direction cosine indices by $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \ldots = 1, 2, \ldots, k-1$ and the azimuthal indices by $i, j, \ldots = 1, 2, \ldots, k$. Note that for instance implicit sums over α always run over $k-1$ values, while sums over i always run over the full k values.

Thus (with vanishing gauge fields) the D-dimensional metric may be expressed in the form

$$G_{MN} = \mathrm{diag}[\widetilde{\Delta}^a g_{\mu\nu}, \widetilde{\Delta}^{-b}\hat{g}_{ij}, \widetilde{\Delta}^{-b}\widetilde{g}_{\alpha\beta}] \ , \tag{7.73}$$

where $\hat{g}_{ij} = X_i^{-1}\mu_i^2\delta_{ij}$ is diagonal and

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{g}_{\alpha\beta} &= X_\alpha^{-1}\delta_{\alpha\beta} + X_k^{-1}\hat{\mu}_\alpha\hat{\mu}_\beta \ , \\ \widetilde{g}^{\alpha\beta} &= X_\alpha\delta_{\alpha\beta} - \widetilde{\Delta}^{-1}X_\alpha X_\beta\mu_\alpha\mu_\beta \ , \end{aligned} \tag{7.74}$$

with $\hat{\mu}_\alpha \equiv \mu_\alpha/\mu_k$. Note that $\det\widetilde{g}_{\alpha\beta} = \widetilde{\Delta}/\mu_k^2$. As the μ_α themselves are coordinates, this allows the use of expressions such as $\partial_\alpha\mu_k = -\hat{\mu}_\alpha$ and $\partial_\alpha\hat{\mu}_\beta = \mu_k^{-1}(\delta_{\alpha\beta} + \hat{\mu}_\alpha\hat{\mu}_\beta)$. In addition, all $\alpha, \beta, \ldots$ indices are raised and lowered with the metric $\widetilde{g}_{\alpha\beta}$.

Using this specific form of the metric $\widetilde{g}_{\alpha\beta}$ and the fact that $\det\hat{g}_{ij} = \prod_{i=1}^k \mu_i^2$, we find $\det G_{MN} = \det g_{\mu\nu}\,\widetilde{\Delta}^{\kappa+2a}\prod_{i=1}^{k-1}\mu_i^2$ where the product provides the measure over the internal S^{2k-1}. Here $\kappa = a(d-2) - b(2k-1) + 1$ so that $\sqrt{-G}R \sim \sqrt{-g}\,\widetilde{\Delta}^{\kappa/2}$. Hence one expects $\kappa = 0$ in order to prevent any $\widetilde{\Delta}$ dependence from appearing in front of the lower-dimensional Einstein term. Indeed we see that κ vanishes for both the S^5 and the S^7 reductions considered in the text.

We have only computed selected components of the full D-dimensional Ricci tensor which are of interest in the Kaluza-Klein reduction. While we have used an asymmetric parameterisation of the direction cosines, the final results are symmetric in all k of the μ_i's. For the lower-dimensional components of R_{MN} we find

$$\begin{aligned} R_{\mu\nu} &= R^{(d)}_{\mu\nu} - \tfrac{1}{2}\kappa\widetilde{\Delta}^{-1}\partial_\mu\partial_\nu\widetilde{\Delta} + \tfrac{1}{4}((a+2)\kappa - (a+b)b(2k-1) + a + 2b)\widetilde{\Delta}^{-2}\partial_\mu\widetilde{\Delta}\partial_\nu\widetilde{\Delta} \\ &\quad + \tfrac{1}{4}(\partial_\mu\widetilde{g}^{\alpha\beta}\partial_\nu\widetilde{g}_{\alpha\beta} - X_i^{-2}\partial_\mu X_i\partial_\nu X_i) \\ &\quad + g_{\mu\nu}[-\tfrac{a}{2}\widetilde{\Delta}^{-1}\nabla^2\widetilde{\Delta} - \tfrac{a}{4}(\kappa-2)\widetilde{\Delta}^{-2}\partial^\rho\widetilde{\Delta}\partial_\rho\widetilde{\Delta}] \\ &\quad + g_{\mu\nu}\widetilde{\Delta}^{a+b}[-\tfrac{a}{4}(\kappa+2a+2b-3)\widetilde{\Delta}^{-2}\partial^\alpha\widetilde{\Delta}\partial_\alpha\widetilde{\Delta} - \tfrac{a}{2}(\widetilde{\Delta}^{-1}\widetilde{\nabla}^2\widetilde{\Delta} + \widetilde{\Delta}^{-1}\mu_i^{-1}\partial^\alpha\mu_i\partial_\alpha\widetilde{\Delta})] \ , \end{aligned} \tag{7.75}$$

where $R^{(d)}_{\mu\nu}$ denotes the Ricci tensor of the d-dimensional spacetime metric $g_{\mu\nu}$. We have also determined the internal Ricci components R_{ij} and $R_{\alpha\beta}$ necessary for com-

puting the D-dimensional scalar curvature. For the former we find

$$\begin{aligned} R_{ij} &= \hat{g}_{ij}\widetilde{\Delta}^{-a-b}[\tfrac{1}{4}\kappa\widetilde{\Delta}^{-1}X_i^{-1}\partial^\rho\widetilde{\Delta}\partial_\rho X_i + \tfrac{b}{2}\widetilde{\Delta}^{-1}\nabla^2\widetilde{\Delta} + \tfrac{b}{4}(\kappa-2)\widetilde{\Delta}^{-2}\partial^\rho\widetilde{\Delta}\partial_\rho\widetilde{\Delta}] \\ &\quad +\hat{g}_{ij}[-\tfrac{1}{2}(\kappa+2a+2b-1)\widetilde{\Delta}^{-1}\mu_i^{-1}\partial^\alpha\mu_i\partial_\alpha\widetilde{\Delta} - \mu_i^{-1}\widetilde{\nabla}^2\mu_i + \widetilde{\Delta}^{-1}(X_i\sum X - X_i^2) \\ &\qquad +\tfrac{b}{4}(\kappa+2a+2b-3)\widetilde{\Delta}^{-2}\partial^\alpha\widetilde{\Delta}\partial_\alpha\widetilde{\Delta} + \tfrac{b}{2}\widetilde{\Delta}^{-1}\widetilde{\nabla}^2\widetilde{\Delta} + \tfrac{b}{2}\widetilde{\Delta}^{-1}\mu_l^{-1}\partial^\alpha\mu_l\partial_\alpha\widetilde{\Delta}] \end{aligned} \tag{7.76}$$

(no sum on i), while for the latter we have

$$\begin{aligned} R_{\alpha\beta} &= \widetilde{\Delta}^{-a-b}[\tfrac{1}{2}\widetilde{g}^{\gamma\delta}\partial^\rho\widetilde{g}_{\alpha\gamma}\partial_\rho\widetilde{g}_{\beta\delta} - \tfrac{1}{4}\kappa\widetilde{\Delta}^{-1}\partial^\rho\widetilde{g}_{\alpha\beta}\partial_\rho\widetilde{\Delta} - \tfrac{1}{2}\nabla^2\widetilde{g}_{\alpha\beta}] \\ &\quad +\widetilde{g}_{\alpha\beta}\widetilde{\Delta}^{-a-b}[\tfrac{b}{4}(\kappa-2)\widetilde{\Delta}^{-2}\partial^\rho\widetilde{\Delta}\partial_\rho\widetilde{\Delta} + \tfrac{b}{2}\widetilde{\Delta}^{-1}\nabla^2\widetilde{\Delta}] \\ &\quad +\widetilde{R}_{\alpha\beta} - \tfrac{1}{2}(\kappa+2a+2b-1)\widetilde{\Delta}^{-1}\widetilde{\nabla}_\alpha\widetilde{\nabla}_\beta\widetilde{\Delta} - \mu_i^{-1}\widetilde{\nabla}_\alpha\widetilde{\nabla}_\beta\mu_i \\ &\quad -\tfrac{1}{4}((b-2)\kappa + a(a+b)d + (b-2)(2a+2b-1))\widetilde{\Delta}^{-2}\partial_\alpha\widetilde{\Delta}\partial_\beta\widetilde{\Delta} \\ &\quad +\widetilde{g}_{\alpha\beta}[\tfrac{b}{2}\widetilde{\Delta}^{-1}\widetilde{\nabla}^2\widetilde{\Delta} + \tfrac{b}{4}(\kappa+2a+2b-3)\widetilde{\Delta}^{-2}\partial^\gamma\widetilde{\Delta}\partial_\gamma\widetilde{\Delta} + \tfrac{b}{2}\widetilde{\Delta}^{-1}\mu_i^{-1}\partial^\gamma\mu_i\partial_\gamma\widetilde{\Delta}] \ . \end{aligned} \tag{7.77}$$

Note that $\widetilde{R}_{\alpha\beta}$ as well as the covariant derivatives $\widetilde{\nabla}_\alpha$ are defined with respect to the $(k-1)$-dimensional metric $d\widetilde{s}^2 = \sum_{i=1}^k X_i^{-1}d\mu_i^2$. While these expressions are rather unwieldy, they simplify considerably in both the S^5 and the S^7 reductions, as many of the coefficients take on simple values.

Finally, by taking the trace of the above, we find the expression for the D-dimensional curvature scalar

$$\begin{aligned} R &= \widetilde{\Delta}^{-a}[R^{(d)} - (\kappa+a)\nabla^\rho(\widetilde{\Delta}^{-1}\nabla_\rho\widetilde{\Delta}) + \tfrac{1}{4}(\partial^\rho\widetilde{g}_{\alpha\beta}\partial_\rho\widetilde{g}^{\alpha\beta} - X_i^{-2}\partial^\rho X_i\partial_\rho X_i) \\ &\qquad +\tfrac{1}{4}(-(\kappa+a)(\kappa-1) + 2b - (a+b)b(2k-1))\widetilde{\Delta}^{-2}\partial^\rho\widetilde{\Delta}\partial_\rho\widetilde{\Delta}] \\ &\quad +\widetilde{\Delta}^b[\widetilde{R} - (\kappa+2a+b-1)(\widetilde{\Delta}^{-1}\widetilde{\nabla}^2\widetilde{\Delta} + \widetilde{\Delta}^{-1}\mu_i^{-1}\partial^\alpha\mu_i\partial_\alpha\widetilde{\Delta}) \\ &\qquad +\tfrac{1}{4}(-(\kappa+2a+b-1)(\kappa+2a+2b-5) - a(a+b)d)\widetilde{\Delta}^{-2}\partial^\alpha\widetilde{\Delta}\partial_\alpha\widetilde{\Delta} \\ &\qquad -2\mu_i^{-1}\widetilde{\nabla}^2\mu_i + \widetilde{\Delta}^{-1}(\sum X)^2 - \widetilde{\Delta}^{-1}\sum X^2] \ . \end{aligned} \tag{7.78}$$

To make contact with the Kaluza-Klein reductions, we note that explicit computation of $\widetilde{R}$ yields

$$\widetilde{R} = \widetilde{\Delta}^{-1}[2\widetilde{\Delta}^{-1}\sum X^3\mu^2 - 2\widetilde{\Delta}^{-1}\sum X\sum X^2\mu^2 + (\sum X)^2 - \sum X^2] \ , \tag{7.79}$$

where we have followed a shorthand notation of removing indices so that, $\sum X^3\mu^2 \equiv \sum_{i=1}^k X_i^3\mu_i^2$, for example. Note that for the special case of $k=3$, corresponding to S^5, not all of the above quantities are independent. As a result we find that this expression simplifies to yield $\widetilde{R}_{(k=3)} = 2\widetilde{\Delta}^{-2}X_1X_2X_3 = 2\widetilde{\Delta}^{-2}$. Additionally, we often

find the following identities useful:

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial^\alpha\widetilde{\Delta}\partial_\alpha\widetilde{\Delta} &= -4[\widetilde{\Delta}^{-1}(\sum X^2\mu^2)^2 - \sum X^3\mu^2] \ , \\
\widetilde{\nabla}^2\widetilde{\Delta} &= 2[\widetilde{\Delta}^{-2}(\sum X^2\mu^2)^2 - \widetilde{\Delta}^{-1}\sum X^3\mu^2 - \widetilde{\Delta}^{-1}\sum X\sum X^2\mu^2 + \sum X^2] \ , \\
\mu_i^{-1}\partial^\alpha\mu_i\partial_\alpha\widetilde{\Delta} &= -2[\widetilde{\Delta}^{-1}\sum X\sum X^2\mu^2 - \sum X^2] \ , \\
\mu_i^{-1}\widetilde{\nabla}^2\mu_i &= \widetilde{\Delta}^{-1}[\widetilde{\Delta}^{-1}\sum X\sum X^2\mu^2 - (\sum X)^2] \ . \qquad (7.80)
\end{aligned}$$

The S^5 reduction of Type IIB supergravity discussed in Section 6.2 corresponds to the choice of $d = 5$ and $a = b = \frac{1}{2}$. In this case we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\widetilde{\Delta}^{1/2}R^{(D=10)}_{(k=3)} &= R^{(5)} - \tfrac{1}{2}\nabla^\rho(\widetilde{\Delta}^{-1}\nabla_\rho\widetilde{\Delta}) - \tfrac{1}{4}(-\partial^\rho\widetilde{g}_{\alpha\beta}\partial_\rho\widetilde{g}^{\alpha\beta} + X_i^{-2}\partial^\rho X_i\partial_\rho X_i + \widetilde{\Delta}^{-2}\partial^\rho\widetilde{\Delta}\partial_\rho\widetilde{\Delta}) \\
&\quad +2(\widetilde{\Delta}^{-1} + 3\sum X^{-1}) \ , \qquad (7.81)
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used the simplified expression for $\widetilde{R}_{(k=3)}$ given above. On the other hand, the S^7 reduction of eleven dimensional supergravity, given by the line element (6.25), corresponds to the choice of $d = 4$ and $a = \frac{2}{3}$, $b = \frac{1}{3}$. The eleven-dimensional curvature scalar is

$$\begin{aligned}
\widetilde{\Delta}^{2/3}R^{(D=11)}_{(k=4)} &= R^{(4)} - \tfrac{2}{3}\nabla^\rho(\widetilde{\Delta}^{-1}\nabla_\rho\widetilde{\Delta}) - \tfrac{1}{4}(-\partial^\rho\widetilde{g}_{\alpha\beta}\partial_\rho\widetilde{g}^{\alpha\beta} + X_i^{-2}\partial^\rho X_i\partial_\rho X_i + \widetilde{\Delta}^{-2}\partial^\rho\widetilde{\Delta}\partial_\rho\widetilde{\Delta}) \\
&\quad -\tfrac{2}{3}\widetilde{\Delta}^{-2}(\sum X^2\mu^2)^2 + \tfrac{8}{3}\widetilde{\Delta}^{-1}\sum X^3\mu^2 - \tfrac{4}{3}\widetilde{\Delta}^{-1}\sum X\sum X^2\mu^2 \\
&\quad +4(\sum X)^2 - \tfrac{14}{3}\sum X^2 \ . \qquad (7.82)
\end{aligned}$$

The last two lines involve undifferentiated scalars, and is used in (6.35). Curiously, the scalar kinetic terms in both cases have an identical structure save for a total derivative, and take on a standard Kaluza-Klein appearance (since $X_i^{-2}\partial^\rho X_i\partial_\rho X_i = -\partial^\rho\hat{g}_{ij}\partial_\rho\hat{g}^{ij}$). Finally note that the implicitly defined term $\partial^\rho\widetilde{g}_{\alpha\beta}\partial_\rho\widetilde{g}^{\alpha\beta}$ may be evaluated to give

$$-\partial^\rho\widetilde{g}_{\alpha\beta}\partial_\rho\widetilde{g}^{\alpha\beta} = X_i^{-2}\partial^\rho X_i\partial_\rho X_i + \widetilde{\Delta}^{-2}\partial^\rho\widetilde{\Delta}\partial_\rho\widetilde{\Delta} - 2\widetilde{\Delta}^{-1}X_i^{-1}\partial^\rho X_i\partial_\rho X_i\mu_i^2 \ . \qquad (7.83)$$

2. The general expression for a rotating p-brane carrying a single charge is given in 7.5. Following the procedure in the previous sections, we may take the limit of large p-brane charge, by performing the rescalings

$$\begin{aligned}
& m \longrightarrow \epsilon^{\tilde{d}} m \ , \qquad \sinh\beta \longrightarrow \epsilon^{-\frac{\tilde{d}}{2}}\sinh\beta \ , \\
& r \longrightarrow \epsilon\, r \ , \qquad x^\mu \longrightarrow \epsilon^{1-\tilde{d}/2}\, x^\mu \ , \qquad \ell_i \to \epsilon\,\ell_i \ , \qquad (7.84)
\end{aligned}$$

and then sending ϵ to zero. We find that the metric becomes $ds^2 = \epsilon^{\alpha^2/2}\, d\tilde{s}^2$, where α is given by (5.31) and the metric $d\tilde{s}^2$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} d\tilde{s}^2_D &= \widetilde{\Delta}^{\frac{\tilde{d}}{D-2}}\, e^{\tilde{d}\varphi}\Big[-(H_1\cdots H_N)^{-\frac{d-2}{d-1}}\, f\, dt^2 \\ &\quad +(H_1\cdots H_N)^{\frac{1}{d-1}}\Big((\frac{\tilde{d}}{d}\, g\rho)^{\frac{(D-2)\alpha^2}{2\tilde{d}}}\, f^{-1}\, d\rho^2 + \rho^2\, d\vec{y}\cdot d\vec{y}\Big)\Big] \\ &\quad +g^{-2}\, \widetilde{\Delta}^{-\frac{d}{D-2}}\, e^{-d\varphi}\, \sum_{i=1}^{N} X_i^{-1}\, \Big(d\mu_i^2 + \mu_i^2 (d\phi_i + g\, A^i)^2\Big)\ , \end{aligned} \tag{7.85}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} &g\,\rho = (d/\tilde{d})\,(g\,r)^{\tilde{d}/d}\ , \qquad \vec{y} = g\,(\tilde{d}/d)\,\vec{x}\ , \\ &g^{-\tilde{d}} = 2m\,\sinh^2\beta\ , \qquad \mu = 2m\,(d/\tilde{d})^{d-2}\, g^{2+\tilde{d}-d}\ , \end{aligned} \tag{7.86}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &f = -\frac{\mu}{\rho^{d-2}} + (\tilde{d}/d)^2 g^2\,\rho^2\,(H_1\cdots H_N)\ , \qquad X_i = (H_1\cdots H_N)^{\frac{d}{(d-1)\tilde{d}}}\, H_i^{-1}\ , \\ &\widetilde{\Delta} = \frac{\sum_i X_i\,\mu_i^2}{(X_1\cdots X_N)^2}\ , \qquad e^{-\frac{2\tilde{d}}{\alpha^2}\varphi} = (\tilde{d}/d)\, g\,\rho\ . \qquad A^i = \frac{1-H_i^{-1}}{g\,\ell_i\,\sinh\beta}\, dt\ . \end{aligned} \tag{7.87}$$

It follows that the $(d+1)$-dimensional metric becomes

$$ds^2_{d+1} = -(H_1\cdots H_N)^{-\frac{d-2}{d-1}}\, f\, dt^2 + (H_1\cdots H_N)^{\frac{1}{d-1}}\Big(e^{-(D-2)\,\varphi}\, f^{-1}\, d\rho^2 + \rho^2\, d\vec{y}\cdot d\vec{y}\Big)\ . \tag{7.88}$$

The Einstein-frame metric is given by $ds^2_E = e^{-\frac{(D-2)}{(d-1)}\varphi}\, ds^2_{d+1}$. This is the metric of an N-charge black hole in a domain-wall background. In the case when $a = 0$, the domain wall specialises to AdS_{d+1}.

8 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Much of the recent work on AdS black holes described in these lectures was carried out in collaboration with my colleagues Miriam Cvetic, Parid Hoxha, Jim Liu, Hong Lü, Jianxin Lu, Rene Martinez Acosta, Chris Pope, Hisham Sati and Tuan Tran. In writing these lectures, I would especially like to thank Jim Liu and Jianxin Lu for their help and Arthur Greenspoon for a careful reading of the manuscript. Conversations with Ergin Sezgin on singletons and related topics are also gratefully acknowledged. I would also like to thank the organizers of the TASI Summer School, K. T. Mahanthappa, Eva Silverstein, Shamit Kachru and Jeff Harvey and the organizers of the Banff Summer School, Yvan Saint-Aubin and Luc Vinet for their hospitality.

9 APPENDICES

A The Lagrangian, symmetries and transformation rules of D=11 supergravity

The unique supermultiplet in $D = 11$ consists of a graviton described by the elfbein $e_M{}^A$, a gravitino described by the Rarita-Schwinger vector-spinor Ψ_M and the 3-form gauge field A_{MNP}. Here letters at the beginning of the alphabet are local Lorentz indices and letters from the middle of the alphabet are spacetime world indices. The Lagrangian is given by

$$\mathcal{L}_{11} = \frac{1}{2{\kappa_{11}}^2} e \left[R - \frac{1}{2.4!} F^{MNPQ} F_{MNPQ} \right] - \frac{1}{12{\kappa_{11}}^2} \frac{1}{3!4!^2} \epsilon^{M_1 \ldots M_{11}} A_{M_1 M_2 M_3} F_{M_4 M_5 M_6 M_7} F_{M_8 M_9 M_{10} M_{11}}$$
$$+ \frac{1}{2{\kappa_{11}}^2} e \left[-2i \bar{\Psi}_M \Gamma^{MNP} D_N (\frac{\omega + \hat{\omega}}{2}) \Psi_P + \frac{i}{96} (\bar{\Psi}_M \Gamma^{MNPQRS} \Psi_N + 12 \bar{\Psi}^P \Gamma^{QR} \Psi_S)(F_{PQRS} + \hat{F}_{PQRS}) \right] \tag{A.1}$$

where

$$\bar{\Psi} = \Psi^\dagger \Gamma^0 \tag{A.2}$$

and Ψ is a Majorana spinor obeying

$$\bar{\Psi} = \Psi^T C^{-1} \tag{A.3}$$

where C is the charge conjugation matrix obeying

$$C^{-1} \Gamma_A C = -{\Gamma_A}^T \tag{A.4}$$

and Γ_A are the $D = 11$ Dirac matrices

$$\{\Gamma^A, \Gamma^B\} = 2\eta^{AB} \tag{A.5}$$

$$\eta^{AB} = diag(-, +, +, \ldots +) \tag{A.6}$$

Furthermore,

$$e = det\ e_M{}^A \tag{A.7}$$

$$F_{MNPQ} = 4 \partial_{[M} A_{NPQ]} \tag{A.8}$$

$$\hat{F}_{MNPQ} = F_{MNPQ} - 3 \bar{\Psi}_{[M} \Gamma_{NP} \Psi_{Q]} \tag{A.9}$$

$$D_M(\omega) \Psi_N = \partial_M \Psi_N + \frac{1}{4} \omega_{NAB} \Gamma^{AB} \tag{A.10}$$

$$\hat{\omega}_{NAB} = \omega_{NAB} - \frac{i}{4} \bar{\Psi}_P \Gamma_{NAB}{}^{PQ} \Psi_Q \tag{A.11}$$

$$\omega_{NAB} = \omega^0{}_{NAB}(e) + \frac{i}{4}\left[\bar{\Psi}_P \Gamma_{NAB}{}^{PQ} \Psi_Q - 2(\bar{\Psi}_N \Gamma_B \Psi_A - \bar{\Psi}_N \Gamma_A \Psi_B + \bar{\Psi}_B \Gamma_N \Psi_A)\right] \quad \text{(A.12)}$$

$$\omega^0{}_{NAB}(e) = e^N{}_A e^P{}_B (\Omega_{PMN} + \Omega_{MNP} - \Omega_{NPM}) \quad \text{(A.13)}$$

where Ω_{MNP} are the anholonomy coefficients

$$[\partial_A, \partial_B] = [e^M{}_A \partial_M, e^N{}_B \partial_N] = \Omega_{AB}{}^C \partial_C \quad \text{(A.14)}$$

and $e^M{}_A$ is the inverse of $e_M{}^A$:

$$e_M{}^A e^{NB} \eta_{AB} = \delta_M{}^N \quad \text{(A.15)}$$

The action is invariant under the following symmetry transformations:

a) $D = 11$ general coordinate transformations with parameter ξ^M:

$$\delta e_M{}^A = e_N{}^A \partial_M \xi^N + \xi^N \partial_N e_M A$$

$$\delta \Psi_M = \Psi_N \partial_M \xi^N + \xi^N \partial_N \Psi_M$$

$$\delta A_{MNP} = 3 A_{Q[MN} \partial_{P]} \xi^Q + \xi^Q \partial_Q A_{MNP} \quad \text{(A.16)}$$

b) Local $SO(1,10)$ Lorentz transformations with parameter $\alpha_{AB} = -\alpha_{BA}$:

$$\delta e_M{}^A = -e_M{}^B \alpha_B{}^A$$

$$\delta \Psi_M = -\frac{1}{4} \alpha_{AB} \Gamma^{AB} \Psi_M$$

$$\delta A_{MNP} = 0 \quad \text{(A.17)}$$

c) $N = 1$ supersymmetry transformations with anticommuting parameter ϵ:

$$\delta e_M{}^A = i \bar{\epsilon} \Gamma^A \Psi_M$$

$$\delta \Psi_M = D_M(\hat{\omega}) \epsilon - \frac{1}{288} (\Gamma_M{}^{PQRS} - 8 \delta_M{}^P \Gamma^{QRS}) \hat{F}_{PQRS} \epsilon$$

$$\delta A_{MNP} = 3 i \bar{\epsilon} \Gamma_{[MN} \Psi_{P]} \quad \text{(A.18)}$$

d) Abelian gauge transformations with parameter $\Lambda_{MN} = -\Lambda_{NM}$:

$$\delta e_M{}^A = 0$$

$$\delta \Psi_M = 0$$

$$\delta A_{MNP} = \partial_{[M} \Lambda_{NP]} \quad \text{(A.19)}$$

e) an odd number of space or time reflections together with

$$A_{MNP} \to -A_{MNP} \quad \text{(A.20)}$$

B The field equations, symmetries and transformation rules of Type IIB supergravity

Next we consider Type IIB supergravity in $D = 10$ [21, 22] which also describes 128 + 128 degrees of freedom, and corresponds to the field-theory limit of the Type IIB superstring. The spectrum of the supergravity theory consists of a complex scalar A, a complex spinor λ, a complex 2-form A_{MN}, a complex Weyl gravitino ψ_M, a real graviton $e_M{}^R$ and a real 4-form A_{MNPQ} whose 5-form field strength F_{MNPQR} obeys a self-duality condition. The complex Weyl spinors ψ_M and λ have opposite handedness

$$\gamma_{11}\psi_M = -\psi_M \tag{B.1}$$

$$\gamma_{11}\lambda = \lambda \tag{B.2}$$

Owing to the self-duality of F_{MNPQR}, there exists no covariant action principle. It is therefore simplest to work directly with the field equations, which are:

$$D^M P_M = \frac{1}{24}\kappa_{10}{}^2 G_{MNP}G^{MNP} + O(\psi^2) \tag{B.3}$$

$$\gamma^M D_M \lambda = \frac{1}{240} i\kappa_{10}\gamma^{P_1\ldots P_5}\lambda F_{P_1\ldots P_5} + O(\psi^2) \tag{B.4}$$

$$D^P G_{MNP} = P^P G^*{}_{MNP} - \frac{2}{3} i\kappa_{10} F_{MNPQR}G^{*PQR} + O(\psi^2) \tag{B.5}$$

$$\gamma^{MNP} D_M \psi_P = -i\frac{1}{2}\gamma^P\gamma^M\lambda^* P_P - \frac{1}{48} i\kappa_{10}\gamma^{NPQ}\gamma^M\lambda G^*{}_{NPQ} + O(\psi^3) \tag{B.6}$$

$$\begin{aligned} R_{MP} - \frac{1}{2}g_{MP}R &= P_M P^*{}_P + P^*{}_M P_P - g_{MP}P^R P^*{}_R + \frac{1}{6}\kappa_{10}{}^2 F_{R_1\ldots R_4 M}F^{R_1\ldots R_4}{}_P \\ &+ \frac{1}{8}\kappa_{10}{}^2(G_M{}^{RS}G^*{}_{PRS} + G^*{}_M{}^{RS}G_{PRS}) - \frac{1}{24}\kappa_{10}{}^2 g_{MP}G^{RST}G^*{}_{RST} + O(\psi^2) \end{aligned} \tag{B.7}$$

$$F_{MNPQR} = *F_{MNPQR} \tag{B.8}$$

where

$$P_M = f^2\partial_M B \tag{B.9}$$

$$G_{MNP} = f(F_{MNP} - BF^*{}_{MNP}) \tag{B.10}$$

$$F_{MNP} = 3\partial_{[M}A_{NP]} \tag{B.11}$$

$$f = (1 - B^*B)^{-1/2} \tag{B.12}$$

$$F_{MNPQR} = 5\partial_{[M}A_{NPQR]} - \frac{5}{4}\kappa_{10} Im(A_{[MN}F^*{}_{PQR]}) \tag{B.13}$$

and where the supercovariant derivative D_M involves the composite $U(1)$ gauge field

$$Q_M = f^2 Im(B\partial_M B^*). \tag{B.14}$$

Our notation is that X^* is the complex conjugate of X while $*X$ is the Hodge dual of X.

We also have the identities

$$D_{[M}P_{P]} = 0 \tag{B.15}$$

$$D_{[M}G_{NPQ]} = -P_{[M}G^{*NPQ]} \tag{B.16}$$

$$\partial_{[P}Q_{M]} = -iP_{[P}P^*{}_{M]} \tag{B.17}$$

$$\partial_{[N}F_{M_1\ldots M_5]} = \frac{5}{12}i\kappa G_{[NM_1M_2}G^*{}_{M_3M_4M_5]} \tag{B.18}$$

The symmetries are $D = 10$ general covariance, local $SO(1,9)$ Lorentz transformations, local supersymmetry with complex Weyl spinor parameter ϵ

$$\gamma_{11}\epsilon = -\epsilon \tag{B.19}$$

and a global $SL(2,R)$ invariance. The supersymmetry transformation rules are

$$\delta B = \kappa_{10} f^{-2}\bar{\epsilon}^*\lambda \tag{B.20}$$

$$\delta A_{MN} = f(\bar{\epsilon}\gamma_{MN}\lambda + 4i\bar{\epsilon}^*\gamma_{[M}\psi_{N]} + B\bar{\epsilon}^*\gamma_{MN}\lambda + 4iB\bar{\epsilon}\gamma_{[M}\psi^*{}_{N]}) \tag{B.21}$$

$$\delta\lambda = \frac{i}{\kappa_{10}}\gamma^M\epsilon^*\hat{P}_M - \frac{1}{24}i\gamma^{MNP}\epsilon\hat{G}_{MNP} \tag{B.22}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\delta\psi_M = {} & \frac{1}{\kappa_{10}}D_M\epsilon + \frac{1}{480}i\gamma^{P_1\ldots P_5}\gamma_M\epsilon\hat{F}_{P_1\ldots P_5} + \frac{1}{96}(\gamma_M{}^{NPQ}\hat{G}_{NPQ} - 9\gamma^{PQ}\hat{G}_{MPQ})\epsilon^* \\ & -\frac{7}{16}\kappa_{10}\left(\gamma_P\lambda\bar{\psi}_M\gamma^P\epsilon^* - \frac{1}{1680}\gamma_{P_1\ldots P_5}\lambda\bar{\psi}_M\gamma^{P_1\ldots P_5}\epsilon^*\right) \\ & +\frac{1}{32}i\kappa_{10}[\left(\frac{9}{4}\gamma_M\gamma^P + 3\gamma^P\gamma_M\right)\epsilon\bar{\lambda}\gamma_P\lambda \\ & -\left(\frac{1}{24}\gamma_P\gamma^{P_1P_2P_3} + \frac{1}{6}\gamma^{P_1P_2P_3}\gamma_M\right)\epsilon\bar{\lambda}\gamma_{P_1P_2P_3}\lambda + \frac{1}{960}\gamma_M\gamma^{P_1\ldots P_5}\epsilon\bar{\lambda}\gamma_{P_1\ldots P_5}\lambda]\end{aligned} \tag{B.23}$$

$$\delta e_M{}^R = -2\kappa_{10}Im(\bar{\epsilon}\gamma^R\psi_N) \tag{B.24}$$

$$\delta A_{MNPQ} = 2Re(\hat{\epsilon}\gamma_{MNP}\psi_{Q]}) - \frac{3}{8}\kappa_{10}(A_{[MN}\delta A^*{}_{PQ]} - A^*{}_{[MN}\delta A_{PQ]} \tag{B.25}$$

where

$$\hat{P}_M = P_M - \kappa_{10}{}^2\bar{\psi}^*{}_M\lambda \tag{B.26}$$

$$\hat{G}_{MNP} = G_{MNP} - 3\kappa_{10}\bar{\psi}_{[M}\gamma_{NP]}\lambda - 6i\kappa_{10}\bar{\psi}^*{}_{[M}\gamma_N\psi_{P]} \tag{B.27}$$

and

$$\hat{F}_{MNPQR} = F_{MNPQR} - 5\kappa_{10}\bar{\psi}_{[M}\gamma_{NPQ}\psi_{R]} - \frac{1}{16}\kappa_{10}\bar{\lambda}\gamma_{MNPQR}\lambda \tag{B.28}$$

and where

$$D_M\epsilon = (\partial_M + \frac{1}{4}\omega_M{}^{RS}\gamma_{RS} - \frac{1}{2}iQ_M)\epsilon \tag{B.29}$$

where

$$\omega_{MNP} = \Omega_{NPM} + \Omega_{NMP} + \Omega_{MPN} \tag{B.30}$$

and

$$\Omega_{MNP} = e^R{}_P\partial_{[M}e_{N]R} + \kappa_{10}{}^2 Im(\bar{\psi}_M\gamma_P\gamma_N) \tag{B.31}$$

The fields transform under $SL(2,R)$ with parameters α and γ as

$$\delta B = \alpha + 2i\gamma B - \alpha^* B^2 \tag{B.32}$$

$$\delta\lambda = \frac{3}{2}i[\gamma + Im(\alpha B^*)]\lambda \tag{B.33}$$

$$\delta\psi_M = \frac{1}{2}i[\gamma + Im(\alpha B^*)]\psi_M \tag{B.34}$$

$$\delta A_{MN} = i\gamma A_{MN} + \alpha A^*{}_{MN} \tag{B.35}$$

$$\delta e_M{}^R = 0 \tag{B.36}$$

$$\delta F_{MNPQR} = 0 \tag{B.37}$$

C The Lagrangian, symmetries and transformation rules of the M2-brane

Let us introduce the coordinates Z^M of a curved superspace

$$Z^M = (x^\mu, \theta^\alpha) \tag{C.1}$$

and the supervielbein $E_M{}^A(Z)$ where $M = \mu, \alpha$ are world indices and $A = a, \alpha$ are tangent space indices. We also define the pull-back

$$E_i{}^A = \partial_i Z^M E_M{}^A \quad . \tag{C.2}$$

We also need the super d-form $A_{CBA}(Z)$. Then the supermembrane action is [41, 42]

$$\begin{aligned} S = T_2 \int d^3\xi \Big[\quad & - \quad \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{-}\gamma\gamma^{ij}E_i{}^a E_j{}^b\eta_{ab} + \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{-}\gamma \\ & + \quad \frac{1}{3!}\epsilon^{i_1\ldots i_d}E_i{}^A E_j{}^B E_k{}^C A_{CBA}\Big]. \end{aligned} \tag{C.3}$$

Note that there is a kinetic term, a worldvolume cosmological term, and a Wess-Zumino term. The target-space symmetries are superdiffeomorphisms, Lorentz invariance and d-form gauge invariance. The worldvolume symmetries are ordinary diffeomorphisms and kappa invariance which we now examine in more detail. The transformation rules are

$$\delta Z^M E^a{}_M = 0, \quad \delta Z^M E^\alpha{}_M = \kappa^\beta (1+\Gamma)^\alpha{}_\beta \tag{C.4}$$

where $\kappa^\beta(\xi)$ is an anticommuting spacetime spinor but worldvolume scalar, and where

$$\Gamma^\alpha{}_\beta = \frac{1}{3!\sqrt{-\gamma}} \epsilon^{ijk} E_i{}^a E_j{}^b \dots E_k{}^c \Gamma_{abc} \quad . \tag{C.5}$$

Here Γ_a are the Dirac matrices in spacetime and

$$\Gamma_{a_1..a_d} = \Gamma_{[a_1 \cdots a_d]} \quad . \tag{C.6}$$

The matrix Γ of (C.5) is traceless and satisfies

$$\Gamma^2 = 1 \tag{C.7}$$

when the equations of motion are satisfied and hence the matrices $(1 \pm \Gamma)/2$ act as projection operators. The transformation rule (C.4) therefore permits us to gauge away one half of the fermion degrees of freedom. As desribed below, this gives rise to a matching of physical boson and fermion degrees of freedom on the worldvolume.

The kappa symmetry is achieved only if certain constraints on the antisymmetric tensor field strength $F_{MNP..Q}(\mathrm{Z})$ and the supertorsion are satisfied. One can show that the constraints on the background fields $E_M{}^A$ and A_{MNP} are nothing but the equations of motion of eleven-dimensional supergravity.

D The field equations, symmetries and transformation rules of the M5-brane

The $M5$-brane equations are elegantly derived from the superembedding formalism which treats the brane as a supermanifold M embedded in a larger spacetime supermanifold $\underline{M}$. In this subsection, therefore, we use the notations and conventions of [230, 231]. In particular, we denote by $z^{\underline{M}} = (x^{\underline{m}}, \theta^{\underline{\mu}})$ the local coordinates on $\underline{M}$, and $A = (a, \alpha)$ is the target tangent space index. We use the ununderlined version of these indices to label the corresponding quantities on the worldvolume. The embedded submanifold M, with local coordinates y^M, is given as $z^{\underline{M}}(y)$.

The suitable pullbacks of the super 3-form and the induced metric are

$$\begin{aligned} A_{ijk} &= \partial_i z^{\underline{M}} \partial_j z^{\underline{N}} \partial_k z^{\underline{P}} A_{\underline{PNM}} \ , \\ \gamma_{ij} &= \left(\partial_i z^{\underline{M}} E_{\underline{M}}{}^{\underline{a}}\right) \left(\partial_j z^{\underline{N}} E_{\underline{N}}{}^{\underline{b}}\right) \eta_{\underline{ab}} \ , \end{aligned} \tag{D.1}$$

where $\eta_{\underline{ab}}$ is the Minkowski metric in eleven dimensions and $E_{\underline{M}}{}^{\underline{A}}$ is the target space supervielbein. We define the basis one-forms $E^{\underline{A}} = d\xi^i \partial_i z^{\underline{M}} E_{\underline{M}}{}^{\underline{A}}$ and $E^A = d\sigma^r \partial_r y^M E_M{}^A$, where $E_M{}^A$ is the supervielbein on M_5. The embedding matrix $E_A{}^{\underline{A}}$ plays an important role in the description of the model, and it is defined as

$$E_A{}^{\underline{A}} \equiv E_A{}^M \partial_M z^{\underline{M}} E_{\underline{M}}{}^{\underline{A}}, \tag{D.2}$$

Here, we give the nonlinear field equations of the superfivebrane equations, up to second order fermionic terms, that follow from the superembedding condition $E_\alpha{}^{\underline{a}} = 0$, which are proposed to arise equally well from the $\mathcal{F}$-constraint $\mathcal{F}_{\alpha BC} = 0$, where we have introduced the super 2-form A_2 and the following super 3-form in M_5:

$$\mathcal{F}_3 \equiv dA_2 - f_5^* A_3 \ . \tag{D.3}$$

and where f_5^* is the pullback associated with the embedding map $f_5 : M_5 \hookrightarrow \underline{M}$. The details of the procedures can be found in [232, 231]. A key point is the emergence of a super 3-form h in world superspace. This form arises in the following component of the embedding matrix

$$E_\alpha{}^{\underline{\alpha}} = u_\alpha{}^{\underline{\alpha}} + h_\alpha{}^{\beta'} u_{\beta'}{}^{\underline{\alpha}} \ , \tag{D.4}$$

where, upon the splitting of the indices to exhibit the $USp(4)$ R-symmetry group indices $i = 1, ..., 4$, we have

$$h_\alpha{}^{\beta'} \to h_{\alpha i \beta}{}^j = \frac{1}{6} \delta_i{}^j (\gamma^{abc})_{\alpha\beta} h_{abc} \ , \tag{D.5}$$

where h_{abc} is a self-dual field defined on M. The pair $(u_\alpha{}^{\underline{\alpha}}, u_{\alpha'}{}^{\underline{\alpha}})$ make up an element of the group $Spin(1, 10)$.

The superembedding formalism was shown to give the following complete $M5$-brane equations of motion:

$$\begin{aligned} E_a{}^{\underline{\alpha}} E_{\underline{\alpha}}{}^{\beta'} (\Gamma^a)_{\beta'}{}^{\alpha} &= 0 \ , \\ \eta^{ab} \nabla_a E_b{}^{\underline{a}} E_{\underline{a}}{}^{b'} &= -\tfrac{1}{8} (\Gamma^{b'a})_{\gamma'}{}^{\beta} Z_{a\beta}{}^{\gamma'} \ , \\ \hat{\nabla}^c h_{abc} &= -\tfrac{1}{32} (\Gamma^c \Gamma_{ab})_{\gamma'}{}^{\beta} Z_{c\beta}{}^{\gamma'} \ , \end{aligned} \tag{D.6}$$

where

$$Z_{a\beta}{}^{\gamma'} = E_\beta{}^{\underline{\beta}} \left(E_a{}^{\underline{a}} T_{\underline{a}\,\underline{\beta}}{}^{\underline{\gamma}} - E_a{}^{\underline{\delta}} E_{\underline{\beta}}{}^{\gamma} (\nabla_\gamma E_{\underline{\delta}}{}^{\delta'}) E_{\delta'}{}^{\underline{\gamma}} \right) E_{\underline{\gamma}}{}^{\gamma'} \ . \tag{D.7}$$

Recall that the inverse of the pair $(E_A{}^{\underline{A}}, E_{A'}{}^{\underline{A}})$ is denoted by $(E_{\underline{A}}{}^A, E_{\underline{A}}{}^{A'})$ and that $A = (a, \alpha)$ label the tangential directions while $A' = (a', \alpha')$ label the normal directions to the $M5$-brane worldvolume.

The non-vanishing parts of the target space torsion components $T_{\underline{\alpha\,\beta}}{}^{\underline{\gamma}}$ are given by

$$\begin{aligned} T_{\underline{\alpha\,\beta}}{}^{\underline{c}} &= -i(\Gamma^{\underline{c}})_{\underline{\alpha\,\beta}} \ , \\ T_{\underline{a\,\beta}}{}^{\underline{\gamma}} &= -\frac{1}{36}(\Gamma^{\underline{bcd}})_{\underline{\beta}}{}^{\underline{\gamma}} F_{\underline{abcd}} - \frac{1}{288}(\Gamma_{\underline{abcde}})_{\underline{\beta}}{}^{\underline{\gamma}} F^{\underline{bcde}} \ , \end{aligned} \tag{D.8}$$

and $T_{\underline{ab}}{}^{\underline{\gamma}}$. The only other non-vanishing components of F_4 are

$$F_{\underline{ab}\gamma\delta} = -i(\Gamma_{\underline{ab}})_{\gamma\delta} \ . \tag{D.9}$$

The covariant derivative $\hat{\nabla}$ has an additional, composite $SO(5,1)$ connection of the form $(\nabla u)u^{-1}$ as explained in more detail in [232].

The $M5$-brane equations of motion (D.6) live in superspace [230, 233]. The component (i.e. Green-Schwarz) form of these equations has also been worked out [232]. Up to fermionic bilinears, the final result is:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_a(1-\Gamma)\gamma^b m_b{}^a &= 0 \ , \\ G^{mn}\nabla_m \mathcal{F}_{npq} &= Q^{-1}\left[4Y - 2(mY + Ym) + mYm\right]_{pq} \ , \\ G^{mn}\nabla_m \mathcal{E}_n{}^{\underline{c}} &= \frac{Q}{\sqrt{-g}}\epsilon^{m_1\cdots m_6}\left(\tfrac{1}{6!}F^{\underline{a}}{}_{m_1\cdots m_6} + \tfrac{1}{(3!)^2}F^{\underline{a}}{}_{m_1m_2m_3}\,\mathcal{F}_{m_4m_5m_6}\right)P_{\underline{a}}{}^{\underline{c}} \ . \end{aligned} \tag{D.10}$$

Several definitions are in order. To begin with,

$$\begin{gathered} m_a{}^b \equiv \delta_a{}^b - 2k_a{}^b \ , \qquad k_a{}^b \equiv h_{acd}h^{bcd} \ , \qquad Q \equiv (1 - \tfrac{2}{3}\mathrm{tr}\, k^2) \ , \\ Y_{ab} \equiv \left[4 * F - 2(m * F + *Fm) + m * Fm\right]_{ab} \ , \\ P_{\underline{a}}{}^{\underline{c}} \equiv \delta_{\underline{a}}{}^{\underline{c}} - \mathcal{E}_{\underline{a}}{}^m \mathcal{E}_m{}^{\underline{c}} \ , \qquad *F^{ab} := \tfrac{1}{4!\sqrt{-g}}\epsilon^{abcdef}F_{cdef} \ , \end{gathered} \tag{D.11}$$

The fields $\mathcal{F}_{abc}$, $F_{\underline{a}_1\cdots\underline{a}_4}$ and its Hodge dual $F_{\underline{a}_1\cdots\underline{a}_7}$ are the purely bosonic components of the superforms

$$\mathcal{F}_3 = dA_2 - \underline{C}_3 \ , \qquad F_4 = dA_3 \ , \qquad F_7 = dA_6 + \tfrac{1}{2}\,A_3 \wedge F_4 \ . \tag{D.12}$$

The remaining nonvanishing component of F_7 is

$$F_{\underline{\alpha\,\beta abcde}} = -i(\Gamma_{\underline{abcde}})_{\underline{\alpha\,\beta}} \ . \tag{D.13}$$

The target space indices on F_4 and F_7 have been converted to worldvolume indices with factors of $\mathcal{E}_m{}^{\underline{a}}$ which are the supersymmetric line elements defined as

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}_m{}^{\underline{a}}(x) &\equiv \partial_m z^{\underline{M}} E_{\underline{M}}{}^{\underline{a}} \qquad \text{at } \theta = 0 \ , \\ \mathcal{E}_m{}^{\underline{\alpha}}(x) &\equiv \partial_m z^{\underline{M}} E_{\underline{M}}{}^{\underline{\alpha}} \qquad \text{at } \theta = 0 \ . \end{aligned} \tag{D.14}$$

The metric

$$\gamma_{mn}(x) \equiv \mathcal{E}_m{}^{\underline{a}} \mathcal{E}_n{}^{\underline{b}} \eta_{\underline{ab}} \ = \ e_m{}^a e_n{}^b \eta_{ab} \tag{D.15}$$

is the standard GS induced metric with determinant g, and G^{mn} is another metric defined as

$$G^{mn} \equiv (m^2)^{ab} e_a{}^m e_b{}^n \ . \tag{D.16}$$

Let us note that the connection in the covariant derivative ∇_m occurring in (4.13) is the Levi-Civita connection for the induced metric g_{mn} up to fermionic bilinears.

A key relation between h_{abc} and $\mathcal{F}_{abc}$ follows from the dimension-0 components of the Bianchi identity $d\mathcal{F}_3 = -\underline{F}_4$, and is given by

$$h_{abc} \ = \ \tfrac{1}{4} m_a{}^d \mathcal{F}_{bcd} \ . \tag{D.17}$$

The matrix Γ is the $\theta = 0$ component of the matrix $\Gamma_{(5)}$ introduced above and it is given by

$$\Gamma \ = \ -\bar{\Gamma} + \tfrac{1}{3} h^{mnp} \Gamma_{mnp} \ = \ -\Big[\exp\left(-\tfrac{1}{3}\Gamma^{mnp} h_{mnp}\right)\Big] \bar{\Gamma} \ , \tag{D.18}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} &\bar{\gamma} \equiv \frac{1}{6!\sqrt{-g}} \epsilon^{m_1 \cdots m_6} \Gamma_{m_1 \cdots m_6} \ , \\ &\Gamma_m \equiv \mathcal{E}_m{}^{\underline{a}} \Gamma_{\underline{a}} \ , \qquad \Gamma^b \equiv \Gamma^m e_m{}^b \ , \qquad e_m{}^b \equiv E_m{}^a m_a{}^b \ . \end{aligned} \tag{D.19}$$

The κ-symmetry transformation rules are

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_\kappa z^{\underline{a}} &= 0 \ , \\ \delta_\kappa z^{\underline{\alpha}} &= \kappa^{\underline{\gamma}} \tfrac{1}{2}(1+\Gamma)_{\underline{\gamma}}{}^{\underline{\alpha}} \ , \\ \delta_\kappa h_{abc} &= -\tfrac{i}{16} m_{d[a} \mathcal{E}^d (1-\Gamma) \Gamma_{bc]} \kappa \ , \end{aligned} \tag{D.20}$$

where Γ is given by (D.18). The κ-symmetry transformations are the fermionic diffeomorphisms of the $M5$-brane worldvolume with parameter $\kappa^\alpha = \kappa^{\underline{\alpha}} E_{\underline{\alpha}}{}^\alpha$. It follows that

$$\delta_\kappa \mathcal{F}_3 \ = \ \{d, i_\kappa\} \mathcal{F}_3 \ = \ -i_\kappa \underline{F}_4 \ , \tag{D.21}$$

which can also be verified by direct computation by combining (4.19) and (D.20).

The equations of motion (4.13) have been shown [234] to be equivalent to those which follow from an action with auxiliary scalar field [235].

We conclude this section by elucidating the consequences of the central equation (4.19). To this end, we first note the useful identities

$$\begin{aligned} h_{abe}h^{cde} &= \delta^{[c}_{[a}k_{b]}{}^{d]} \ , \\ k_{ac}k_b{}^c &= \tfrac{1}{6}\eta_{ab}\mathrm{tr}\ k^2 \ , \\ k_a{}^d h_{bcd} &= k_{[a}{}^d h_{bc]d} \ , \end{aligned} \tag{D.22}$$

which are consequences of the linear self-duality of h_{abc}. Taking the Hodge dual of (4.19) one finds $*\mathcal{F}_{abc} = -\mathcal{F}_{abc} + 2Q^{-1}m_a{}^d\mathcal{F}_{bcd}$. Using the identity $m^2 = 2m - Q$, we readily find the nonlinear self-duality equation

$$*\,\mathcal{F}_{mnp} = Q^{-1}G_m{}^q\mathcal{F}_{npq} \ . \tag{D.23}$$

This equation can be expressed solely in terms of $\mathcal{F}_3$. To do this, we first insert (4.19) into (4.20), which yields the identities

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_{abe}\mathcal{F}^{cde} &= 2\delta^{[c}_{[a}X_{b]}{}^{d]} + \tfrac{1}{2}K^{-2}X_{[a}{}^cX_{b]}{}^d + 2(K^2-1)\delta^c_{[a}\delta^d_{b]} \ , \\ X_{ac}X_b{}^c &= 4K^2(K^2-1)\eta_{ab} \ , \\ X_a{}^d\mathcal{F}_{bcd} &= X_{[a}{}^d\mathcal{F}_{bc]d} \ . \end{aligned} \tag{D.24}$$

where we have defined

$$K \equiv \sqrt{1 + \tfrac{1}{24}\mathcal{F}^{abc}\mathcal{F}_{abc}} \ , \tag{D.25}$$

$$X_{ab} \equiv \tfrac{1}{2}K * \mathcal{F}_a{}^{cd}\mathcal{F}_{bcd} \ . \tag{D.26}$$

Next we derive the identities

$$\begin{aligned} Q(K+1) &= 2 \ , \\ X_{ab} &= \tfrac{1}{2}\mathcal{F}_{acd}\mathcal{F}_b{}^{cd} - \tfrac{1}{12}\eta_{ab}\mathcal{F}_{cde}\mathcal{F}^{cde} = 4K(1+K)k_{ab} \ . \end{aligned} \tag{D.27}$$

We can now express (4.21) entirely in terms of $\mathcal{F}_3$ by deriving the identity

$$Q^{-1}G_{mn} = K\eta_{mn} - \tfrac{1}{2}K^{-1}X_{mn} \ . \tag{D.28}$$

Another way of writing (4.21) is

$$\mathcal{F}^-_{abc} \;=\; \tfrac{1}{2}(1+K)^{-2}\mathcal{F}^+_{ade}\mathcal{F}^{+def}\mathcal{F}^+_{fbc}\ , \tag{D.29}$$

where K is a root of the quartic equation

$$(K+1)^3(K-1) \;=\; \tfrac{1}{24}\mathcal{F}^{+abc}\mathcal{F}^+_{ade}\mathcal{F}^{+def}\mathcal{F}^+_{fbc}\ . \tag{D.30}$$

E The Lagrangian, symmetries and transformation rules of the D3-brane

Here we present a Lorentz invariant and supersymmetric worldvolume action for all Type II Dirichlet p-branes, $p \leq 9$, in a general Type II supergravity background [236]. The super Dirichlet p-brane action, in a general $N = 2$ supergravity background (for the string-frame metric) takes the form

$$S_d = S_{dDBI} + S_{dWZ} \tag{E.1}$$

where

$$S_{dDBI} = -T_d \int d^d\xi\, e^{-\phi}\sqrt{-\det(\gamma_{ij}+\mathcal{F}_{ij})} \tag{E.2}$$

is a Dirac-Born-Infeld type action and I_{WZ} is a Wess-Zumino (WZ) type action to be discussed below; $\mathcal{F}_{ij}$ are the components of a 'modified' 2-form field strength

$$\mathcal{F} = F - B\ , \tag{E.3}$$

where $F = dV$ is the usual field strength 2-form of the BI field V and B is the pullback to the worldvolume of a 2-form potential B on superspace, whose leading component in a θ-expansion is the 2-form potential of Neveu-Schwarz/Neveu-Schwarz (NS-NS) origin in Type II superstring theory. We use the same letter for superspace forms and their pullbacks to the worldvolume since it should be clear from the context which is meant. Superspace forms may be expanded in the coordinate basis of 1-forms dZ^M or on the inertial frame basis $E^A = dZ^M E_M{}^A$, where $E_M{}^A$ is the supervielbein. The basis E^A decomposes under the action of the Lorentz group into a Lorentz vector E^a and a Lorentz spinor. The latter is a 32-component Majorana spinor for IIA superspace and a pair of chiral Majorana spinors for IIB superspace. Thus

$$(E^a, E^{\alpha\ I}), I = 1, 2 \tag{E.4}$$

for Type IIB. We allow α to run from 1 to 32 but include a chiral projector as appropriate. The worldvolume metric g_{ij} appearing in (E.2) is defined in the standard way as

$$\gamma_{ij} = E^a_i E^b_j \eta_{ab} \tag{E.5}$$

where η is the $D = 10$ Minkowski metric and

$$E_i^A = \partial_i Z^M E_M{}^A \ . \tag{E.6}$$

Thus I_{DBI} is a straightforward extension to superspace of the corresponding term in the bosonic action. The same is true for the WZ term. We introduce a R-R potential A as a formal sum of r-form superspace potentials $A^{(r)}$, i.e.

$$A = \sum_{r=0}^{10} A^{(r)} \ . \tag{E.7}$$

The even potentials are those of IIB supergravity while the odd ones are those of IIA supergravity. In the bosonic case one could omit the 10-form gauge potential $F^{(10)}$ on the grounds that its 11-form field strength is identically zero. But an 11-form field strength on *superspace* is not identically zero; in fact we shall see that it is non-zero even in a Minkowski background, a fact that is crucial to the κ-symmetry of the super 9-brane action.

The WZ term can now be written as

$$S_{dWZ} = T_d \int_W A e^{\mathcal{F}} \ + \ m I_{CS} \tag{E.8}$$

where, in the first term, the product is understood to be the exterior product of forms and the form of appropriate degree is chosen in the 'form-expansion' of the integrand, i.e. $(p+1)$ for a Dirichlet p-brane. The I_{CS} term is a $(p+1)$-form Chern-Simons (CS) action that is present (for odd p) in a *massive* IIA background; its coefficient m is the IIA mass parameter. This WZ term is formally the same as the known *bosonic* Dirichlet p-brane WZ action, but here the forms $C^{(r)}$ and B are taken to be forms on *superspace*, e.g.

$$A^{(r)} = \frac{1}{r!} dZ^{M_1} \cdots dZ^{M_r} A_{M_r \ldots M_1} \ . \tag{E.9}$$

This illustrates the standard normalization and the 'reverse order' convention for components of superspace forms. This convention goes hand in hand with the convention for exterior differentiation of superspace forms in which the exterior derivative acts 'from the right'. Thus,

$$dA^{(r)} = \frac{1}{r!} dZ^{M_1} \cdots dZ^{M_r} dZ^N \partial_N A_{M_r \ldots M_1} \tag{E.10}$$

The field strength for the R-R field A is

$$F(A) = dA - HA + m e^B \tag{E.11}$$

where m is the mass parameter of the IIA theory. $F(A)$ can be written as the formal sum

$$F(A) = \sum_{n=1}^{11} F^{(n)} \ . \tag{E.12}$$

Note that the top form is an 11-form because we included a 10-form $A^{(10)}$ in the definition of A. The field strengths $F^{(n)}$ will be subject to superspace constraints, to be given below for bosonic backgrounds, in addition to the constraint relating the bosonic components of $F^{(n)}$ to the Hodge dual of the bosonic components of $F^{(10-n)}$.

Each term in (E.1) is separately invariant under the global IIA or IIB super-Poincaré group as well as under $(p+1)$-dimensional general coordinate transformations. However, local kappa symmetry is achieved by a subtle conspiracy between them, just as in the case of super p-branes with scalar supermultiplets.

In these lectures, we are primarily interested in the $D3$-brane and so may set $p = 3$ in the above formulae.

F D=4, N=2 gauged supergravity

The $SO(8)$ gauged $N = 8$ supergravity in four dimensions was obtained in [157, 158] by gauging an $SO(8)$ subgroup of the global E_7 symmetry group of [189, 190]. To avoid some of the complications of non-abelian gauge fields, one may consider a truncation of this model to $N = 2$, for which the bosonic sector comprises the metric, four commuting $U(1)$ gauge potentials, three dilatons and three axions. In the absence of axions, this truncation was obtained in [150] by working in the symmetric gauge for the 56-bein and incorporating three real scalars. As was noted, there is a straightforward generalization of the scalar ansatz to allow for complex scalars. Taking into account the E_7 self-duality condition $\overline{\phi}^{ijkl} = \phi_{ijkl} = \frac{1}{4!}\epsilon_{ijklmnpq}\phi^{mnpq}$, the scalar ansatz of [150] may be generalized as:

$$\overline{\phi}^{ijkl} = \phi_{ijkl} = \sqrt{2}[\Phi^{(1)}\epsilon^{(12)} + \Phi^{(2)}\epsilon^{(13)} + \Phi^{(3)}\epsilon^{(14)} + \overline{\Phi}^{(1)}\epsilon^{(34)} + \overline{\Phi}^{(2)}\epsilon^{(24)} + \overline{\Phi}^{(3)}\epsilon^{(23)}]_{ijkl}, \quad \text{(F.1)}$$

where we follow the notation and conventions of [150] (including the definition of $SO(8)$ index pairs). Note that the three complex scalars may be parameterised in terms of their magnitudes and phases as $\Phi^{(i)} = \phi^{(i)}e^{i\theta^{(i)}}$.

Here, we shall consider the full $N = 2$ truncation, where the three axions are included as well as the other fields. In fact the structure of the potential is little changed. We find that the Lagrangian including the axions may be written in the form

$$e^{-1}\mathcal{L}_4 = R - \tfrac{1}{2}\sum_i \Big((\partial\phi^{(i)})^2 + \sinh^2\phi^{(i)}(\partial\theta^{(i)})^2\Big) - \tfrac{1}{2}(F^{(\alpha)+}_{\mu\nu}\mathcal{M}_{\alpha\beta}F^{(\beta)+\mu\nu} + \text{h.c.}) - g^2V\ , \quad \text{(F.2)}$$

where the potential is given simply by

$$V = -8(\cosh\phi^{(1)} + \cosh\phi^{(2)} + \cosh\phi^{(3)})\ . \quad \text{(F.3)}$$

The complex symmetric scalar matrix $\mathcal{M}$ is quite complicated, and incorporates all three complex scalars $\Phi^{(\alpha)}$ in a symmetric manner; this is presented below.

In terms of the $N = 2$ truncation, the three complex scalars each parameterise an $SL(2;R)/SO(2)$ coset. This may be made explicit by performing the change of variables $(\phi^{(i)}, \theta^{(i)}) \to (\varphi_i, \chi_i)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \cosh\phi^{(i)} &= \cosh\varphi_i + \tfrac{1}{2}\chi_i^2\, e^{\varphi_i} \ , \\ \cos\theta^{(i)}\sinh\phi^{(i)} &= \sinh\varphi_i - \tfrac{1}{2}\chi_i^2\, e^{\varphi_i} \ , \\ \sin\theta^{(i)}\sinh\phi^{(i)} &= \chi_i\, e^{\varphi_i} \ . \end{aligned} \tag{F.4}$$

Defining the dilaton-axion combinations

$$A_i = 1 + \chi_i^2\, e^{2\varphi_i} \ , \tag{F.5}$$

as well as

$$\begin{aligned} B_1 &= \chi_2\,\chi_3\, e^{\varphi_2+\varphi_3} + i\chi_1\, e^{\varphi_1} \ , \\ B_2 &= \chi_1\,\chi_3\, e^{\varphi_1+\varphi_3} + i\chi_2\, e^{\varphi_2} \ , \\ B_3 &= \chi_1\,\chi_2\, e^{\varphi_1+\varphi_2} + i\chi_3\, e^{\varphi_3} \ , \end{aligned} \tag{F.6}$$

we finally obtain the bosonic Lagrangian

$$e^{-1}\mathcal{L}_4 = R - \tfrac{1}{2}\sum_i \Big((\partial\varphi_i)^2 + e^{2\varphi_i}(\partial\chi_i)^2\Big) - \tfrac{1}{2}(F^{(\alpha)+}_{\mu\nu}\mathcal{M}_{\alpha\beta}F^{(\beta)+\mu\nu} + \text{h.c.}) - g^2V \ . \tag{F.7}$$

The potential V is now given by

$$V = -8\sum_i \Big(\cosh\varphi_i + \tfrac{1}{2}\chi_i^2\, e^{\varphi_i}\Big) \ , \tag{F.8}$$

and the scalar matrix is

$$\mathcal{M} = \frac{1}{D}\begin{bmatrix} e^{-\lambda_1} & e^{\varphi_1}B_1 & e^{\varphi_2}B_2 & e^{\varphi_3}B_3 \\ e^{\varphi_1}B_1 & e^{-\lambda_2}A_2A_3 & -e^{-\varphi_3}A_3B_3 & -e^{-\varphi_2}A_2B_2 \\ e^{\varphi_2}B_2 & -e^{-\varphi_3}A_3B_3 & e^{-\lambda_3}A_1A_3 & -e^{-\varphi_1}A_1B_1 \\ e^{\varphi_3}B_3 & -e^{-\varphi_2}A_2B_2 & -e^{-\varphi_1}A_1B_1 & e^{-\lambda_4}A_1A_2 \end{bmatrix} \ , \tag{F.9}$$

where

$$D = 1 + \chi_1^2\, e^{2\varphi_1} + \chi_2^2\, e^{2\varphi_2} + \chi_3^2\, e^{2\varphi_3} - 2i\,\chi_1\,\chi_2\,\chi_3\, e^{\varphi_1+\varphi_2+\varphi_3} \ . \tag{F.10}$$

The scalar combinations $\{\lambda\}$ are defined as in [150]:

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_1 &= -\varphi_1 - \varphi_2 - \varphi_3 \ , \\ \lambda_2 &= -\varphi_1 + \varphi_2 + \varphi_3 \ , \\ \lambda_3 &= \ \ \varphi_1 - \varphi_2 + \varphi_3 \ , \\ \lambda_4 &= \ \ \varphi_1 + \varphi_2 - \varphi_3 \ . \end{aligned} \tag{F.11}$$

While this $N = 2$ truncation of the $N = 8$ theory essentially treats all four $U(1)$ gauge fields equally, it was noted that one can make contact with the theory obtained by reduction of a closed string on T^2 through dualisation of two of the gauge fields. To be specific, we dualise $F^{(2)}_{\mu\nu}$ and $F^{(4)}_{\mu\nu}$, which singles out the dilaton-axion pair $S = \chi_2 + ie^{-\varphi_2}$. After an additional field redefinition $S \to -1/S$, we obtain the bosonic Lagrangian

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-1}\mathcal{L}_4^{\rm dualized} &= R - \tfrac{1}{2}(\partial\varphi_2)^2 - \tfrac{1}{2}e^{2\varphi_2}(\partial\chi_2)^2 + \tfrac{1}{8}{\rm Tr}(\partial ML\partial ML) - g^2V \\ &\quad -\tfrac{1}{4}e^{-\varphi_2}F^T(LML)F - \tfrac{1}{4}\chi_2\, F^T L{*}F\ , \end{aligned} \tag{F.12}$$

where the potential is still given by (F.8). The scalar matrix M is given in terms of the $SL(2;R)\times SL(2;R)$ vielbein

$$\mathcal{V} = e^{\varphi_3/2}\begin{bmatrix} 1 & -\chi_3 \\ 0 & e^{-\varphi_3}\end{bmatrix} \otimes e^{\varphi_1/2}\begin{bmatrix} 1 & -\chi_1 \\ 0 & e^{-\varphi_1}\end{bmatrix}, \tag{F.13}$$

by $M = \mathcal{V}^T\mathcal{V}$, and the gauge fields have been arranged in the particular order

$$F_{\mu\nu} = [\, F^{(3)}_{\mu\nu} \quad \widetilde{F}^{(4)}_{\mu\nu} \quad \widetilde{F}^{(2)}_{\mu\nu} \quad -F^{(1)}_{\mu\nu}\,]^T. \tag{F.14}$$

Finally, $L = \sigma^2\otimes\sigma^2$ satisfies $L^2 = I_4$, where σ^2 is the standard Pauli matrix. It is worth mentioning that the pure scalar Lagrangian can be expressed as

$$e^{-1}\mathcal{L}_{\rm scalar} = \sum_{i=1}^{3}\Big[-\tfrac{1}{2}{\rm tr}\partial\mathcal{M}_i\partial\mathcal{M}_i^{-1} + 4g^2{\rm tr}\mathcal{M}_i\Big]\ , \tag{F.15}$$

where $\mathcal{M}_i = \mathcal{V}_i^T\,\mathcal{V}_i$ and $\mathcal{V}_i$ is given by

$$\mathcal{V}_i = e^{\varphi_i/2}\begin{bmatrix} 1 & -\chi_i \\ 0 & e^{-\varphi_i}\end{bmatrix}\ . \tag{F.16}$$

We see that, save for the potential, the dualized Lagrangian is indeed of the form obtained from T^2 compactification from six dimensions. In this case, two of the $SL(2;R)$'s now correspond to T-dualities while the third corresponds to S-duality. Note that the initial choice of which two field strengths to dualise has determined which of the three dilaton-axion pairs (φ_i,χ_i) is to be identified with the strong-weak coupling $SL(2;R)$.

Having shown that the bosonic Lagrangian is considerably simplified by dualising to the field variables that arise in the T^2 reduction, we may re-express the result (F.12) in the more explicit notation of [168, 191]. Thus the bosonic sector of the gauged $U(1)^4$ theory may be written as

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-1}\mathcal{L}_4 &= R - \tfrac{1}{2}(\partial\vec{\varphi})^2 - \tfrac{1}{2}e^{-\vec{a}\cdot\vec{\varphi}}\,(\partial\chi)^2 - \tfrac{1}{2}e^{\vec{a}_{12}\cdot\vec{\varphi}}\,(F_{(1)12})^2 - \tfrac{1}{2}e^{\vec{b}_{12}\cdot\vec{\varphi}}\,(\mathcal{F}^1_{(1)2})^2 - g^2V \\ &\quad -\tfrac{1}{4}\sum_{i=1}^{2}\Big(e^{\vec{a}_i\cdot\vec{\varphi}}\,(F_{(2)i})^2 + e^{\vec{b}_i\cdot\vec{\varphi}}\,(\mathcal{F}^i_{(2)})^2\Big) - \tfrac{1}{2}\chi\,\epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}\,F_{\mu\nu\,i}\,\mathcal{F}^i_{\rho\sigma}\ , \end{aligned} \tag{F.17}$$

where the field strengths are given by

$$\begin{aligned} F_{(2)1} &= dA_{(1)1} + dA_{(0)12}\mathcal{A}^2_{(1)} \ , \qquad \mathcal{F}^1_{(2)} = d\mathcal{A}^1_{(2)} - d\mathcal{A}^1_{(0)2}\,\mathcal{A}^2_{(1)} \ , \\ F_{(2)2} &= dA_{(1)2} - \mathcal{A}^1_{(0)2}\,dA_{(1)1} - dA_{(0)12}\,A^1_{(1)} \ , \qquad \mathcal{F}^2_{(2)} = d\mathcal{A}^2_{(1)} \ . \end{aligned} \tag{F.18}$$

Here χ, $A_{(0)12}$ and $\mathcal{A}^1_{(0)2}$ are the axions χ_2, χ_1 and χ_3, and the potential is given by (F.8).

The inclusion of the potential term in the gauged supergravity theory breaks all three $SL(2;R)$ symmetries to $O(2)$, acting as $\tau \to (a\tau + b)/(c\tau + d)$, where

$$\begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos\alpha/2 & \sin\alpha/2 \\ -\sin\alpha/2 & \cos\alpha/2 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{F.19}$$

In terms of the original (ϕ, θ) scalar variables in (F.2), this $O(2)$ subgroup corresponds to $\theta \longrightarrow \theta + \alpha$. The $O(2)$ symmetry is, however, sufficient for generating dyonic solutions. Nevertheless, we note that the fermionic sector and in particular the supersymmetry transformations are not invariant under this symmetry of the bosonic sector. One manifestation of this particular situation is the fact that magnetic black holes of this theory are not supersymmetric, even though they may be extremal. Furthermore, in a related note, while it is clear that the dualisation procedure performed above runs into difficulty in the full $N = 8$ theory with non-abelian $SO(8)$ gauging, the fermionic sector does not admit such a straightforward dualisation, even in the $N = 2$ abelian truncation. This is easily seen by the fact that the gravitini are necessarily charged under the gauge fields and hence couple to the bare gauge potentials themselves.

References

[1] J. Wess and J. Bagger, *Supersymmetry and supergravity*, Princeton University Press (1983).

[2] S. J. Gates, Jr., M. T. Grisaru, M. Rocek and W. Siegel, *Superspace or one thousand and one lessons in supersymmetry*, Benjamin Cummings (1983).

[3] Prem P. Srivastava, *Supersymmetry, superfields and supergravity*, Adam Hilger (1986).

[4] P. West, *Introduction to supersymmetry and supergravity*, World Scientific (1986).

[5] D. Bailin and A. Love, *Supersymmetric gauge field theory and string theory*, I. O. P.

[6] M. J. Duff, *M-theory: the theory formerly known as strings*, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A11** (1996) 5623.

[7] M. J. Duff, R. R. Khuri and J. X. Lu, *String solitons*, Phys. Rep. **259** (1995) 213, hep-th/9412184

[8] D. Z. Freedman and A. Das, *Gauge internal symmetry in extended supergravity*, Phys. Lett. **B74** (1977) 333.

[9] S. M. Christensen, M. J. Duff, G. W. Gibbons and M. Rocek, *Vanishing one-loop β-function in gauged $N > 4$ supergravity*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **45**, 161 (1980).

[10] M. J. Duff, *Ultraviolet divergences in extended supergravity*, in Proceedings of the 1981 Trieste Conference "Supergravity 81", eds. Ferarra and Taylor, C. U. P. 1982.

[11] B. de Wit and H. Nicolai, $N = 8$ *supergravity*, Nucl. Phys. **B208** (1982) 323.

[12] E. Cremmer, B. Julia and J. Scherk, *Supergravity theory in eleven dimensions*, Phys. Lett. **B76** (1978) 409.

[13] M. J. Duff and C. N. Pope, *Kaluza-Klein supergravity and the seven sphere*, in Proceedins of the 1982 Trieste conference "Supersymmetry and Supergravity 82", eds Ferrara, Taylor and van Nieuwenhuizen, World Scientific 1983.

[14] E. Cremmer and J. Scherk, *Spontaneous compactification of extra space dimensions*, Nucl. Phys. **B118** (1977) 61.

[15] P. G. O. Freund and M. A. Rubin, *Dynamics of dimensional reduction*, Phys. Lett. **B97** (1980) 233.

[16] M. J. Duff and P. van Nieuwenhuizen, *Quantum inequivalence of different field representations*, Phys. Lett. **B94** (1980) 179.

[17] K. Pilch, P. K. Townsend and P. van Nieuwenhuizen, *Compactification of $d = 11$ supergravity on S^4 (or $11 = 7 + 4$, too)*, Nucl. Phys. **B242** (1984) 377.

[18] M. Pernici, K. Pilch and P. van Nieuwenhuizen, *Gauged maximally extended supergravity in seven dimensions*, Phys. Lett. **B143** (1984) 103.

[19] P. K. Townsend and P. van Nieuwenhuizen, *Gauged seven-dimensional supergravity*, Phys. Lett. **B125** (1983) 41-6.

[20] M. J. Duff, B. E. W. Nilsson and C. N. Pope, *Kaluza-Klein supergravity*, Phys. Rep. **130** (1986) 1.

[21] J. H. Schwarz, *Covariant field equations of chiral $N = 2$ $D = 10$ supergravity*, Nucl. Phys. **B226** (1983) 269.

[22] P. Howe and P.C. West, *The complete $N = 2$, $d = 10$ supergravity*, Nucl. Phys. **B238** (1984) 181.

[23] J. H. Schwarz, *Spontaneous compactification of extended supergravity in ten dimensions*, Physica **A124** (1984) 543.

[24] M. Günaydin and N. Marcus, *The spectrum of the S^5 compactification of the $N = 2$, $D = 10$ supergravity and the unitary supermultiplet*, Class. Quant. Grav. **2** (1985) L11.

[25] H. J. Kim, L. J. Romans and P. van Nieuwenhuizen, *Mass spectrum of chiral ten-dimensional $N = 2$ supergravity on S^5*, Phys. Rev. **D32** (1985) 389.

[26] M. Pernici, K. Pilch and P. van Nieuwenhuizen, *Gauged $N = 8$, $d = 5$ supergravity*, Nucl. Phys. **B259** (1985) 460.

[27] M. Günaydin, L. J. Romans and N. P. Warner, *Gauged $N = 8$ supergravity in five dimensions*, Phys. Lett. **B154** (1985) 268.

[28] M. Günaydin, *Singleton and doubleton supermultiplets of space-time supergroups and infinite spin superalgebras*, in Proceedings of the 1989 Trieste Conference "Supermembranes and Physics in $2 + 1$ Dimensions", eds Duff, Pope and Sezgin, World Scientific 1990.

[29] P. A. M. Dirac, *A remarkable representation of the 3+2 de Sitter group*, J. Math. Phys. **4** (1963) 901.

[30] C. Fronsdal, *Dirac supermultiplet*, Phys. Rev. **D26** (1982) 1988.

[31] M. Flato and C. Fronsdal, *Quantum field theory of singletons. The rac*, J. Math. Phys. **22** (1981) 1100.

[32] W. Heidenreich, *All linear, unitary, irreducible representations of de Sitter supersymmetry with positive energy*, Phys. Lett. **B110** (1982) 461.

[33] D. Z. Freedman and H. Nicolai, *Multiplet shortening in $OSp(4|8)$*, Nucl. Phys. **B237** (1984) 342.

[34] E. Sezgin, *The spectrum of the eleven dimensional supergravity compactified on the round seven sphere*, Trieste preprint, 1983, in Supergravity in Diverse Dimensions, vol. 2, 1367, (eds A. Salam and E. Sezgin World Scientific, 1989); Fortschr. Phys. **34** (1986) 217.

[35] H. Nicolai and E. Sezgin, *Singleton representations of $OSp(N,4)$*, Phys. Lett. **B143** (1984) 389.

[36] M. Günaydin, L.J. Romans and N.P. Warner, *Spectrum generating algebras in Kaluza-Klein theories*, Phys. Lett. **B146** (1984) 401.

[37] W. Nahm, *Supersymmetries and their representations*, Nucl. Phys. **B135** (1978) 149.

[38] M. J. Duff, *Supermembranes: The first fifteen weeks*, Class. Quant. Grav. **5**, 189 (1988).

[39] M. P. Blencowe and M. J. Duff, *Supersingletons*, Phys. Lett. **B203**, 229 (1988).

[40] H. Nicolai, E. Sezgin and Y. Tanii, *Conformally invariant supersymmetric field theories on $S^p \times S^1$ and super p-branes*, Nucl. Phys. **B305** (1988) 483.

[41] E. Bergshoeff, E. Sezgin and P. Townsend, *Supermembranes and eleven-dimensional supergravity*, Phys. Lett. **B189** (1987) 75.

[42] E. Bergshoeff, E. Sezgin and P. Townsend, *Properties of the eleven-dimensional supermembrane theory*, Ann. Phys. **185** (1988) 330.

[43] E. Bergshoeff, E. Sezgin and Y. Tanii. *Stress tensor commutators and Schwinger terms in singleton theories*, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A5** (1990) 3599.

[44] E. Bergshoeff, M. J. Duff, C. N. Pope and E. Sezgin, *Supersymmetric supermembrane vacua and singletons*, Phys. Lett. **B199**, 69 (1988).

[45] E. Bergshoeff, M. J. Duff, C. N. Pope and E. Sezgin, *Compactifications of the eleven-dimensional supermembrane*, Phys. Lett. **B224**, 71 (1989).

[46] M. J. Duff and C. Sutton, *The membrane at the end of the universe* New. Sci. **118** (1988) 67.

[47] M. J. Duff, *Classical and quantum supermembranes*, Class. Quant. Grav. **6**, 1577 (1989).

[48] M. P. Blencowe and M. J. Duff, *Supermembranes and the signature of spacetime*, Nucl. Phys. **B310** 387 (1988).

[49] E. Bergshoeff, A. Salam, E. Sezgin, Y. Tanii, $N = 8$ *supersingleton quantum field theory*, Nucl.Phys. **B305** (1988) 497.

[50] M. J. Duff, C. N. Pope and E. Sezgin, *A stable supermembrane vacuum with a discrete spectrum*, Phys. Lett. **B225**, 319 (1989).

[51] M.J. Duff and K.S. Stelle, *Multi-membrane solutions of $D = 11$ supergravity*, Phys. Lett. **B253** (1991) 113.

[52] A. Achucarro, J. Evans, P. Townsend and D. Wiltshire, *Super p-branes*, Phys. Lett. **B198** (1987) 441.

[53] M. Günaydin, B. E. W. Nilsson, G. Sierra and P. K. Townsend, *Singletons and superstrings*, Phys. Lett. **B176** (1986) 45.

[54] M. J. Duff, P. K. Townsend and P. van Nieuwenhuizen, *Spontaneous compactification of supergravity on the three-sphere*, Phys. Lett. **B122** (1983) 232.

[55] M. J. Duff, *Supermembranes*, lectures given at the T. A. S. I. Summer School, University of Colorado, Boulder, June 1996; the Topical Meeting, Imperial College, London, July 1996 and the 26th British Universities Summer School in Theoretical Elementary Particle Physics, University of Swansea, September 1996. Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A11** (1996) 5623, hep-th/9611203.

[56] C. M. Hull, *Duality and the signature of spacetime*, hep-th/9807127.

[57] G. T. Horowitz and A. Strominger, *Black strings and p-branes*, Nucl. Phys. **B360** (1991) 197.

[58] M. J. Duff and J. X. Lu, *The self-dual Type IIB superthreebrane*, Phys. Lett. **B273** (1991) 409.

[59] C. G. Callan, J. A. Harvey and A. Strominger, *World sheet approach to heterotic instantons and solitons*, Nucl. Phys. **B359** (1991) 611.

[60] C. G. Callan, J. A. Harvey and A. Strominger, *Worldbrane actions for string solitons*, Nucl. Phys. **B367** (1991) 60.

[61] M. J. Duff and J. X. Lu, *Type II p-branes: the brane scan revisited*, Nucl. Phys. **B390** (1993) 276.

[62] R. Gueven, *Black p-brane solutions of $D = 11$ supergravity theory*, Phys. Lett. **B276** (1992) 49.

[63] J.T. Liu and R. Minasian, *Black holes and membranes in AdS_7*, hep-th/9903269.

[64] G. W. Gibbons and P. K. Townsend, *Vacuum interpolation in supergravity via super p-branes*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71** (1993) 3754.

[65] M. J. Duff, G. W. Gibbons and P. K. Townsend, *Macroscopic superstrings as interpolating solitons*, Phys. Lett. B. **332** (1994) 321.

[66] G. W. Gibbons, G. T. Horowitz and P. K. Townsend, *Higher-dimensional resolution of dilatonic black hole singularities*, Class. Quant. Grav. **12** (1995) 297.

[67] M.J. Duff, H. Lü, C.N. Pope and E. Sezgin, *Supermembranes with fewer supersymmetries*, Phys. Lett. **B371** (1996) 206, hep-th/9511162.

[68] L. Castellani, A. Ceresole, R. D'Auria, S. Ferrara, P. Fré and M. Trigiante, *G/H M-branes and AdS_{p+2} geometries*, hep-th/9803039.

[69] M. A. Awada, M. J. Duff and C. N. Pope, *$N = 8$ supergravity breaks down to $N = 1$*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **50** (1983) 294.

[70] M. J. Duff, B. E. W. Nilsson and C. N. Pope, *Spontaneous supersymmetry breaking via the squashed seven sphere*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **50** (1983) 2043.

[71] T. Nagano and K. Yano, Ann. Math. **69** (1959) 451.

[72] M.J. Duff and J.X. Lu, *Black and super p-branes in diverse dimensions*, Nucl. Phys. **B416** (1994) 301.

[73] M.J. Duff and J. Rahmfeld, *Bound states of black holes and other p-branes*, Nucl. Phys. **B481** (1996) 332.

[74] N. Khviengia, Z. Khviengia, H. Lü and C.N. Pope, *Interecting M-branes and bound states*, Phys. Lett. **B388** (1996) 21.

[75] M. J. Duff, S. Ferrara, R. Khuri and J. Rahmfeld, *Supersymmetry and dual string solitons*, Phys. Lett. **B356** (1995) 479.

[76] M. J. Duff and J. Rahmfeld, *Massive string states as extreme black holes*, Phys. Lett. **B345** (1995) 441.

[77] D. Z. Freedman and G. W. Gibbons, *Electrovac ground state in gauged $SU(2) \times SU(2)$ supergravity*, Nucl. Phys. **B233** (1984) 24.

[78] P. Claus, R. Kallosh, J. Kumar, P.K. Townsend and A. Van Proeyen, *Supergravity and the large N limit of theories with sixteen supercharges*, hep-th/9801206.

[79] G. Dall'Agata, D. Fabbri, C. Fraser, P. Fré, P. Termonia and M. Trigiante, *The $OSp(4|8)$ singleton action from the supermembrane* hep-th/9807115.

[80] A. A. Tseytlin, *Extreme dyonic black holes in string theory*, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A11** (1996) 689, hep-th/9601177.

[81] M. Cvetic and A. A. Tseytlin, *General class of BPS saturated black holes as exact superstring solutions*, Phys. Lett. **B366** (1996) 95, hep-th/9510097.

[82] M. Cvetic and A. A. Tseytlin, *Solitonic strings and BPS saturated dyonic black holes*, Phys. Rev. **D53** (1996) 5619, hep-th/9512031.

[83] M. J. Duff, H. Lü and C. N. Pope, *Supersymmetry without supersymmetry*, Phys. Lett. **B409** (1997) 136, hep-th/9704186.

[84] S. Kachru and E. Silverstein, *4d conformal field theories and strings on orbifolds*, hep-th/9802183.

[85] M.J. Duff, B.E.W. Nilsson and C.N. Pope, *Compactification of $D = 11$ supergravity on $K3 \times T^3$*, Phys. Lett. **B129** (1983) 39.

[86] M. J. Duff, H. Lü and C. N. Pope, *$AdS_5 \times S^5$ untwisted*, hep-th/9803061.

[87] M. J. Duff, H. Lü and C. N. Pope, *$AdS_3 \times S^3$ (un)twisted and squashed*, hep-th/9807173.

[88] E. Halyo, *Supergravity on $AdS_{5/4}$ x Hopf fibrations and conformal field theories*, hep-th/9803193.

[89] D.N. Page and C.N. Pope, *Which compactifications of $D = 11$ supergravity are stable?*, Phys. Lett. **B144** (1984) 346.

[90] Y. Oz and J. Terning, *Orbifolds of $AdS_5 \times S^5$ and 4-D conformal field theories*, hep-th/9803167.

[91] L. Romans, *New compactifications of chiral $N = 2$, $d = 10$ supergravity*, Phys. Lett. **B153** (1985) 392.

[92] I. Klebanov and E. Witten, *Superconformal field theory on three-branes at a Calabi-Yau singularity*, hep-th/9807080.

[93] L.J. Romans, *Gauged $N = 4$ supergravities in five dimensions and their magnetovac backgrounds*, Nucl. Phys. **B267** (1986) 443.

[94] M. J. Duff, P. Howe, T. Inami and K. S. Stelle, *Superstrings in $D = 10$ from supermembranes in $D = 11$,* Phys. Lett. **B191** (1987) 70.

[95] M. J. Duff and J. X. Lu, *Duality rotations in membrane theory*, Nucl.Phys. **B347** (1990) 394.

[96] C. M. Hull and P. K. Townsend, *Unity of superstring dualities*, Nucl. Phys. **B438** (1995) 109.

[97] P. K. Townsend, *The eleven-dimensional supermembrane revisited*, Phys.Lett.**B350** (1995) 184.

[98] E. Witten, *String theory dynamics in various dimensions*, Nucl. Phys. **B443** (1995) 85.

[99] M. J. Duff, J. T. Liu and R. Minasian, *Eleven-dimensional origin of string/string duality: A one loop test*, Nucl.Phys. **B452** (1995) 261.

[100] K. Becker, M. Becker and A. Strominger, *Fivebranes, membranes and nonperturbative string theory*, Nucl.Phys. **B456** (1995) 130.

[101] J. H. Schwarz, *The power of M-theory*, Phys. Lett. **B360** (1995) 13.

[102] P. Horava and E. Witten, *Heterotic and Type I string dynamics from eleven dimensions*, Nucl. Phys. **B460** (1996) 506.

[103] P. Townsend, *D-Branes From M-Branes*, Phys. Lett. **B373** (1996) 68.

[104] O. Aharony, J. Sonnenschein and S. Yankielowicz, *Interactions of strings and D-branes from M-theory*, Nucl. Phys. **B474** (1996) 309.

[105] M. J. Duff, *M-theory (the theory formerly known as strings)*, I. J. M. P **A11** (1996) 5623.

[106] T. Banks, W. Fischler, S. H. Shenker and L. Susskind, *M theory as a matrix model: a conjecture*, Phys. Rev. **D55** (1997) 5112.

[107] R. Slansky, *Group theory for unified model building*, Phys. Rep. **79** (1981) 1.

[108] B.E.W. Nilsson and C.N. Pope, *Hopf fibration of $D = 11$ supergravity*, Class. Quantum Grav. **1** (1984) 499.

[109] E. Witten, *Strong coupling and the cosmological constant*, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A10** (1995) 2153.

[110] M. J. Duff and C. Orzalesi, *The cosmological constant in spontaneously compactified $D = 11$ supergravity*, Phys. Lett. **B122** (1983) 37.

[111] J. Maldacena, *The large N limit of superconformal field theories and supergravity*, hep-th/9711200.

[112] J. Polchinski, *Dirichlet branes and Ramond-Ramond charges*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75** (1995) 4724

[113] E. Witten, *Bound states of strings and p-branes*, Nucl. Phys. **B460** (1996) 335, hep-th/9510135.

[114] S. S. Gubser, I. R. Klebanov and A. W. Peet, *Entropy and temperature of black 3-branes*, Phys. Rev. **D54** (1996) 3915, hep-th/9602135.

[115] I. R. Klebanov, *World volume approach to absorption by non-dilatonic branes*, Nucl. Phys. **B496** 231, hep-th/9702076.

[116] S. S. Gubser, I. R. Klebanov and A. A. Tseytlin, *String theory and classical absorption by three-branes*, Nucl. Phys. **B499** (1997) 217, hep-th/9703040.

[117] S. S. Gubser and I. R. Klebanov, *Absorption by branes and Schwinger terms in the world volume theory*, Phys. Lett. **B413** (1997) 41, hep-th/9708005.

[118] N. Itzhak, J. M. Maldacena, J. Sonnenschein and S. Yankielowicz, *Supergravity and the large N limit of theories with sixteen supercharges*, hep-th/9802042.

[119] S. Ferrara and C. Fronsdal, *Conformal Maxwell theory as a singleton field theory on AdS_5, IIB three-branes and duality*, hep-th/9712239.

[120] R. Kallosh, J. Kumar and A. Rajaraman, *Special conformal symmetry of worldvolume actions*, hep-th/9712073.

[121] H. J. Boonstra, B. Peters, K. Skenderis, *Branes and anti-de Sitter space-time*, hep-th/9801076.

[122] M. Günaydin and D. Minic, *Singletons, doubletons and M-theory*, hep-th/9802047.

[123] S. S. Gubser, I. R. Klebanov and A. M. Polyakov, *Gauge theory correlators from non-critical string theory*, hep-th/9802109.

[124] G. T. Horowitz and H. Ooguri, *Spectrum of large N gauge theory from supergravity*, hep-th/9802116.

[125] E. Witten, *Anti-de Sitter space and holography*, hep-th/9802150.

[126] M. Berkooz, *A supergravity dual of a $(1,0)$ field theory in six dimensions*, hep-th/9802195.

[127] S. Ferrara and C. Fronsdal, *On $N = 8$ supergravity on AdS_5 and $N = 4$ superconformal Yang-Mills theory*, hep-th/9802203.

[128] Soo-Jong Rey and Jungtay Lee, *Macroscopic strings as heavy quarks in large N gauge theory and anti-de Sitter supergravity*, hep-th/9803001.

[129] J. Maldacena, *Wilson loops in large N field theories*, hep-th/9803002.

[130] A. Lawrence, N. Nekrasov and C. Vafa, *On conformal field theories in four dimensions*, hep-th/9803015.

[131] G. t'Hooft, *Dimensional reduction in quantum gravity*, gr-qc/9310026.

[132] L. Susskind, *The world as a hologram*, hep-th/9409089.

[133] S.W. Hawking and C.N. Pope, *Generalised spin structures in quantum gravity*, Phys. Lett. **B73** (1978) 42.

[134] C.N. Pope, *Eigenfunctions and spin^c structures in CP^2*, Phys. Lett. **B97** (1980) 417.

[135] M.J. Duff, H. Lü, C.N. Pope, *Heterotic phase transitions and singularities of the gauge dyonic string*, hep-th/9603037.

[136] M.J. Duff, James T. Liu, H. Lü, C.N. Pope, *Gauge dyonic strings and their global limit*, hep-th/9711089.

[137] H.J. Boonstra, B. Peeters and K. Skenderis, *Duality and asymptotic geometries*, Phys. Lett. **B411** (1997) 59, hep-th/9706192.

[138] H.J. Boonstra, B. Peeters and K. Skenderis, *Brane intersections, anti-de Sitter spacetimes and dual superconformal theories*, hep-th/9803231.

[139] G.T. Horowitz, J. Maldacena and A. Strominger, *Nonextremal black hole microstates and U duality*, hep-th/9603109.

[140] G.T. Horowitz and A. Strominger, *Counting states of near extremal black holes*, hep-th/9602051.

[141] N. Seiberg and E. Witten, *The D1/D5 system and singular CFT*, hep-th/9903224.

[142] J. Maldacena, J. Michelson and A. Strominger, *Anti-de Sitter Fragmentation*, hep-th/9812073.

[143] J. Maldacena and A. Strominger, *AdS_3 black holes and a stringy exclusion principle*, hep-th/9804085.

[144] L.J. Romans, *Supersymmetric, cold and lukewarm black holes in cosmological Einstein-Maxwell theory*, Nucl. Phys. **B383** (1992) 395; *Black holes in cosmological Einstein-Maxwell theory*, in "Trieste 1992, Proceedings, High energy physics and cosmology" 416.

[145] K. Behrndt, A.H. Chamseddine and W.A. Sabra, *BPS black holes in $N = 2$ five-dimensional AdS supergravity*, Phys. Lett. **B442** (1998) 97, hep-th/9807187.

[146] D. Birmingham, *Topological black holes in ante-de Sitter space*, hep-th/9808032.

[147] M. M. Caldarelli and D. Klemm, *Supersymmetry of anti-de Sitter black holes*, hep-th/9808097.

[148] D. Klemm, *BPS black holes in gauged $N = 4$ $D = 4$ supergravity*, hep-th/9810090.

[149] K. Behrndt, M. Cvetic and W.A. Sabra, *Non-extreme black holes five-dimensional $N = 2$ AdS supergravity*, hep-th/9810227.

[150] M.J. Duff and J.T. Liu, *Anti-de Sitter black holes in gauged N=8 supergravity*, hep-th/9901149.

[151] A. Chamblin, R. Emparan, C.V. Johnson and R.C. Myers, *Charged AdS black holes and catastrophic holography*, hep-th/9902170.

[152] M. Cvetic and S.S. Gubser, *Phases of R charged black holes, spinning branes and strongly coupled gauge theories*, hep-th/9902195.

[153] M. Cvetic and S.S. Gubser, *Thermodynamic stability and phases of general spinning branes*, hep-th/9903132.

[154] W. Sabra, *Anti-de Sitter black holes in N=2 gauged supergravity*, hep-th/9903143.

[155] M.M. Caldarelli and D. Klemm, *M-theory and stringy corrections to anti-de Sitter black holes and conformal field theories*, hep-th/9903078.

[156] E. Witten, *Anti-de Sitter space, thermal phase transition, and confinement in gauge theories*, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **2** (1998) 505, hep-th/9803131.

[157] B. de Wit and H. Nicolai, *$N = 8$ supergravity with local $SO(8) \times SU(8)$ invariance*, Phys. Lett. **B108** (1982) 285.

[158] B. de Wit and H. Nicolai, *N=8 supergravity*, Nucl. Phys. **B208** (1982) 323.

[159] M.J. Duff and C.N. Pope, *Kaluza-Klein supergravity and the seven-sphere*, in: Supersymmetry and supergravity 82, eds. S. Ferrara, J.G. Taylor and P. van Nieuwenhuizen (World Scientific, Singapore, 1983).

[160] M.J. Duff, *Anti-de Sitter space, branes, singletons, superconformal field theories and all that*, hep-th/9808100.

[161] M.J. Duff and C.N. Pope, *Consistent truncations in Kaluza-Klein theories*, Nucl. Phys. **B255** (1985) 355.

[162] C.N. Pope, *Consistency of truncations in Kaluza-Klein*, published in the Proceedings of the 1984 Santa Fe meeting.

[163] B. de Wit, H. Nicolai and N.P. Warner, *The embedding of gauged $N = 8$ supergravity into $D = 11$ supergravity*, Nucl. Phys. **B255** (1985) 29.

[164] M. J. Duff, B. E. W Nilsson, C. N. Pope and N. Warner, *On the consistency of the Kaluza-Klein ansatz*, Phys. Lett. **B149** (1984) 90.

[165] B. de Wit and H. Nicolai, *The consistency of the S^7 truncation in $D = 11$ supergravity*, Nucl. Phys. **B281** (1987) 211.

[166] M.J. Duff, J.T. Liu and J. Rahmfeld, *Four-dimensional string-string-string triality*, Nucl. Phys. **B459** (1996) 125, hep-th/9508094.

[167] M. Cvetic and D. Youm, *Dyonic BPS saturated black holes of heterotic string on a six torus*, Phys. Rev. **D53** (1996) 584, hep-th/9507090.

[168] H. Lü and C.N. Pope, *p-brane solitons in maximal supergravities*, Nucl. Phys. **B465** (1996) 127, hep-th/9512012.

[169] R.R. Khuri and T. Ortin, *Supersymmetric black holes in $N = 8$ supergravity*, Nucl. Phys. **B467** (1996) 355.

[170] M. Cvetic and A.A. Tseytlin, *General class of BPS saturated dyonic black holes as exact superstring solutions*, Phys. Lett. **B366** (1996) 95, hep-th/9510097.

[171] A.A. Tseytlin, *Harmonic superpositions of M-branes*, Nucl. Phys. **B475** (1996) 149, hep-th/9604035.

[172] M. Cvetic and D. Youm, *Near BPS saturated rotating electrically charged black holes as string states*, Nucl. Phys. **B477** (1996) 449, hep-th/9605051.

[173] M. Cvetic and D. Youm, *Rotating intersecting M-branes*, Nucl. Phys. **B499** (1997) 253, hep-th/9612229.

[174] S. Gubser, *Thermodynamics of spinning D3-branes*, hep-th/9810225.

[175] C. Csaki, Y. Oz, J. Russo and J. Terning, *Large N QCD from rotating branes*, hep-th/9810186.

[176] P. Kraus, F. Larsen and S.P. Trivedi, *The Coulomb branch of gauge theory from rotating branes*, hep-th/9901056.

[177] R. Cai and K. Soh, *Critical behavior in the rotating D-branes*, hep-th/9812121.

[178] P. Kraus, F. Larsen and S.P. Trivedi, *The Coulomb branch of gauge theory from rotating branes*, hep-th/9811120.

[179] J.G. Russo and K. Sfetsos, *Rotating D3-branes and QCD in three dimensions*, hep-th/9901056.

[180] C. Csaki, J. Russo, K. Sfetsos and J. Terning, *Supergravity Models for* $3+1$ *Dimensional QCD*, hep-th/9902067.

[181] K. Sfetsos, *Rotating NS5-brane solution and its exact string theoretical description*, hep-th/9903201.

[182] K.S. Thorne, *Black holes: the membrane paradigm*, New Haven, USA: Yale Univ. Pr. (1986) 367p.

[183] R.C. Myers and M.J. Perry, *Black holes in higher dimensional spacetimes*, Ann. Phys. **172** (1986) 304.

[184] M. Cvetic, H. Lü and C.N. Pope, *Spacetimes of boosted p-branes and CFT in infinite momentum frame*, hep-th/9810123, to appear in Nucl. Phys. **B**.

[185] B.E.W. Nilsson, *On the embedding of* $d = 4$, $N = 8$ *gauged supergravity in* $d = 11$, $N = 1$ *supergravity*, Phys. Lett. **B155** (1985) 54.

[186] C.N. Pope, *The embedding of the Einstein-Yang-Mills equations in* $D = 11$ *supergravity*, Class. Quantum Grav. **2** (1985) L77.

[187] M. Pernici, K. Pilch and P. van Nieuwenhuizen, *Noncompact gaugings and critical points of maximal supergravity in seven dimensions*, Nucl. Phys. **B249** (1985) 381.

[188] H. Lü, C.N. Pope, E. Sezgin and K.S. Stelle, *Dilatonic p-brane solitons*, Phys. Lett. **B371** (1996) 46, hep-th/9511203.

[189] E. Cremmer and B. Julia, *The* $N = 8$ *supergravity theory. 1. The Lagrangian*, Phys. Lett. **B80** (1978) 48.

[190] E. Cremmer and B. Julia, *The* $SO(8)$ *supergravity*, Nucl. Phys. **B159** (1979) 141.

[191] E. Cremmer, B. Julia, H. Lü and C.N. Pope, *Dualisation of dualities*, Nucl. Phys. **B523** (1998) 73, hep-th/9710119.

[192] M. J. Duff and J. Rahmfeld, *Bound states of black holes and other p-branes*, Nucl. Phys. **B481** (1996) 332.

[193] P. C. Aichelburg and F. Embacher, *Exact superpartners of $N = 2$ supergravity solitons*, Phys. Rev. **D34** (1986) 3006.

[194] M. J. Duff, J. T. Liu and J. Rahmfeld, *Dipole moments of black holes and string states*, Nucl. Phys. **B494** (1997) 161.

[195] D. Z. Freedman and H. Nicolai, *Multiplet shortening in $OSp(N, 4)$*, Nucl. Phys. **B237** (1984) 342.

[196] M. J. Duff and J. Rahmfeld, *Massive string states as extreme black holes*, Phys. Lett. **B345** (1995) 441.

[197] M. M. Caldarelli and D. Klemm, *Supersymmetry of anti-de Sitter black holes*, `hep-th/9808097`.

[198] J. Rahmfeld, *Extremal black holes as bound states*, Phys. Lett. **B372** (1996) 198.

[199] C. R. Graham and R. Lee, *Einstein metrics with prescribed conformal infinity on the ball*, Adv. Math. **87** (1991) 186.

[200] E. Cremmer, *Symmetries in extended supergravity*, in Supergravity 81, Eds S. Ferrara and J. G. Taylor, (C. U. P. 1982).

[201] M. J. Duff, *Supermembranes*, Lectures given at the Theoretical Advanced Study Institute in Elementary Particle Physics (TASI 96), Boulder, 1996, hep-th/9611203.

[202] Abdus Salam and Ergin Sezgin, *Supergravities in diverse dimensions*, World Scientific (1989).

[203] E. Witten, *Fermion quantum numbers in Kaluza-Klein theory*, in Proceedings of the Shelter Island II conference (1983) 227, eds Khuri, Jackiw, Weinberg and Witten (M. I. T. Press, 1985).

[204] M. J. Duff, B. E. W. Nilsson and C. N. Pope, *Kaluza-Klein supergravity*, Phys. Rep. 130 (1986) 1.

[205] M. J. Duff, *Kaluza-Klein theory in perspective*, in the Proceedings of the Nobel Symposium *Oskar Klein Centenary*, Stockholm, September 1994, (Ed Lindstrom, World Scientific 1995), hep-th/9410046.

[206] P. K. Townsend, *M(embrane) theory on T^9*, in the Strings 97 Proceedings, hep-th/9708054.

[207] M. Cvetic, M.J. Duff, P. Hoxha, James T. Liu, H. Lu, J.X. Lü, R. Martinez-Acosta, C.N. Pope, H. Sati and T.A. Tran, *Embedding AdS black holes in ten and eleven dimensions*, hep-th/9903214.

[208] K. Akama, *Pregeometry* in *Lecture Notes in Physics, 176, Gauge Theory and Gravitation, Proceedings, Nara, 1982*, edited by K. Kikkawa, N. Nakanishi and H. Nariai, (Springer-Verlag) 267-271, hep-th/000113.

[209] V. A. Rubakov and M. E. Shaposhnikov, *Do we live inside a domain wall?*, Phys. Lett. **B125** (1983) 136.

[210] G.W. Gibbons and D.L. Wiltshire, *Space-time as a membrane in higher dimensions*, Nucl. Phys. **B287** (1987) 717.

[211] G. T. Horowitz and A. Strominger, *Black strings and p-branes*, Nucl. Phys. **B360** (1991) 197.

[212] I. Antoniadis, *A possible new dimension at a few TeV*, Phys. Lett. **B246** (1990) 377.

[213] E. Witten, *Strong coupling expansion of Calabi-Yau compactification*, Nucl. Phys. **B471** (1996) 135.

[214] J. Lykken, *Weak sclae superstrings* Phys. Rev. **D54** (1996) 3693.

[215] N. Arkani-Hamed, S. Dimopoulos and G. Dvali, *The hierarchy problem and new dimensions at a millimeter*, Phys. Lett. **B429** (1998) 263.

[216] K. R. Dienes, E. Dudas and T. Gherghetta, *Extra space-time dimensions and unification*, Phys. Lett. **B436** (1998) 55.

[217] E. Witten, *Search for a realistic Kaluza-Klein theory*, Nucl. Phys. **B186** (1981) 412-428.

[218] L. Castellani, R. D'Auria and P. Fré, *Supergravity and superstrings: a geometric perspective*, (in 3 volumes), World Scientific Press, 1991.

[219] K. S. Stelle, *An introduction to p-branes*, In *Seoul/Sokcho 1997, Dualities in gauge and string theories 39-104.

[220] S. P. De Alwis, *A note on brane tension and M-theory*, `hep-th/9607011`.

[221] O. Aharony, S Gubser, J. Maldacena, H. Ooguri and Y. Oz, *Large N field theories , string theory and gravity*, hep-th/9905111.

[222] S. K. Han and I. G. Koh, $N = 4$ *supersymmetry remaining in Kaluza-Klein monopole background in* $D = 11$ *supergravity*, Phys. Rev. **D31** (1985) 2503.

[223] H. Nastase, D. Vaman, P. van Nieuwenhuizen, *Consistent nonlinear KK reduction of 11-D supergravity on* $AdS_7 \times S^4$ *and selfduality in odd dimensions*, hep-th/9905075.

[224] H. Nastase, D. Vaman, P. van Nieuwenhuizen, *Consistency of the* $AdS_7 \times S^4$ *reduction and the origin of selfduality in odd dimensions*, hep-th/9911238.

[225] H. Lü and C. N. Pope, *Exact embedding of* $N = 1$, $D = 7$ *gauged supergravity in* $D = 11$, hep-th/9906168.

[226] H. Lü, C. N. Pope and T.A. Tran, *Five-dimensional* $N = 4$, $SU(2) \times U(1)$ *gauged supergravity from Type* IIB, hep-th/9909203.

[227] M. Cvetic, H. Lü and C. N. Pope, *Four-dimensional* $N = 4$ $SO(4)$ *gauged supergravity from* $D = 11$, hep-th/9910252.

[228] S.W. Hawking and H.S. Reall, *Charged and rotating AdS black holes and their CFT duals*, hep-th/9908109.

[229] M. Günaydin and S. Takemae, *Unitary supermultiplets of* $OSp(8 * |4)$ *and their* AdS_7/CFT_6 *duality*, hep-th/9910110.

[230] P.S. Howe and E. Sezgin, *Superbranes*, Phys. Lett. **B390** (1997) 133, hep-th/9607227.

[231] E. Sezgin and P. Sundell, *Aspects of the* $M5$*-brane*, hep-th/9902171.

[232] P.S. Howe, E. Sezgin and P.C. West, *Covariant field equations of the M-theory five-brane*, Phys. Lett. **399B** (1997) 49.

[233] P.S. Howe and E. Sezgin, *D=11,p=5*, Phys. Lett. **B394** (1997) 62.

[234] I. Bandos, K. Lechner, A. Nurmagambetov, P. Pasti, D. Sorokin and M. Tonin, *Covariant action for the superfivebrane of M-theory*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78** (1997) 4332.

[235] I. Bandos, K. Lechner, A. Nurmagambetov, P. Pasti, D. Sorokin and M. Tonin, *On the equivalence of different formulations of the M theory five-brane*, hep-th/9703127.

[236] E. Bergshoeff and P.K. Townsend, *Super D-branes*, Nucl. Phys. **B490**, 145 (1997)

[237] L. Randall and R. Sundrum, *A large mass hierarchy from a small extra dimension*, hep-th/9905221.

[238] L. Randall and R. Sundrum, *An alternative to compactification*, hep-th/9906064.

[239] J. L. Petersen, *Introduction to the Maldacena conjecture on AdS/CFT*, hep-th/9902131.

[240] E. Witten and S. T. Yau, *Connectedness of the boundary in the AdS/CFT correspondence*, hep-th/9910245.

[241] T. Banks, *M theory and cosmology*, hep-th/9911067

[242] M. J. Duff, *The world in eleven dimensions: supergravity, supermembranes and M-theory*, a reprint volume with commentaries, I.O.P Publishing, 1999.

[243] P. Van Nieuwenhuizen, *Supergravity*, Phys. Rept. **68** (1981) 189.

[244] C. Ahn and S-J. Rey, *Three-dimensional CFTs and RG flow from squashing M2-brane horizon*, hep-th/9908110

[245] K. Landsteiner and E. Lopez, *The thermodynamic potentials of Kerr-AdS black holes and their CFT duals*, hep-th/9911124.

[246] S. Deser, D. Seminara, *Counterterms/M-theory corrections to $D = 11$ supergravity*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82** (1999) 2435.

[247] T. Harmark and N. A. Obers, *Thermodynamics of spinning branes and their dual field theories*, hep-th/9910036.

[248] T. Harmark and N. A. Obers, *Phase structure of non-commutative field spinning branes and their dual field theories*, hep-th/9911169.